THE MADRAS
Christian College Magazine.

VOL. XXV. OCTOBER, 1907. No. 4.

THE TRAGIC FACT IN LIFE.

As revealed in 'King Lear' by William Shakespeare.

A STORY is told of a Persian Shah who proposed to collect scholars together and set them a-writing the history of Mankind. "It is needless, Sire," said his Vizier, "for I will give you that history in three short sentences." And at the Shah's command he continued, "Hear then, oh King, the history of Mankind.—We are born; we suffer; and we die."

To all men at times, to some men persistently and continuously, the two prominent facts of human life are Suffering and Death. Let us give these words their widest extension of meaning. 'Suffering' then will signify not only physical pain and fatigue, but also the sorrow of soul-weariness, the grief of wounded and broken hearts. The word 'Death' will conjure up before us not only the dread messenger whose summons none may disobey, but also the destruction of our hopes and dreams, the decay that overtakes the mightiest of our accomplishments, the common grave of all our systems. Add to what these words convey the throng of emotions that are called up by the term 'Evil,' and we stand in the solemn presence of the Sphinx.

It is a refined and difficult atmosphere, and it may be as well that we do not live in it continuously. The ordinary round of common life, the daily pursuits, our worldly ambitions and desires, our loves and hates, physical need, the joy of life,—all these compel us to take life as it comes, to accept the world's coin at its face-value. We are not big enough to stare Death in the face continuously. Were we to attempt it, we should be unnerved and helpless in the presence of suffering. As it is, when suffering and death force themselves upon our attention, we rarely think of their ultimate significance. It is the common end of man, we

say, and with a sigh strive to alleviate the worst effects, apply our narcotics, and return to the duty nearest to hand. And it is so in the world of nature around. Siva the destroyer is continually being supplanted by Vishnu the preserver. The fly's death is the spider's life. The deer must die, if the tiger is to eat. The strength and beauty of the tree is drawn through its roots from decaying rottenness. And, above all, is the glad song of the bird that has carried the worm to its hungry nestlings. To contemplate Death and Suffering, then, to the exclusion of all else seems as little reasonable as to ignore them entirely and sing a continuous pæan on the joyousness of life.—But yet after all why, when we speak of life's *enigma*, do we always think of the dark side, of sin, of pain, of destruction? We would accept God, a God of love, gladly and without question. It is God manifesting as the Devil that alone puzzles our persistent optimism. There must be some significance in the fact that we feel ourselves more close to the Ultimate Reality of things, when touched by the hand of sorrow than when joy calls forth our laughter. "It is better," said Solomon of old, "to go to the house of mourning, than to go to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men: and the living will lay it to his heart."

There are two men whose special business it is continually to remind a gay and frivolous world of the presence of the Sphinx. Poet and Prophet we call them. It is hard to distinguish between them. Indeed, in a sense it is impossible. For they are both about the same work: both bent on forth-telling the realities of the universe. It is in their manner, and something in the character of the two, that the difference must be found. The poet, more emotional, pours out his soul in verse: the prophet, more intellectual, speaks in prose. The poet puts the Sphinx's question, shews us its innermost significance, stirs in us a deep longing for solution. The prophet gives the satisfying answer, satisfying at least for his age. The poet is secular, human, mundane. The prophet speaks of God and Faith, and treads fearlessly among the stars. The prophet asserts Eternal Providence and justifies the ways of God to man. He is religious and his aim is to compel complete acquiescence in the justice of the Divine Order. The Poet pleads Humanity's cause. Romance and Mystery pervade all his message. That no man completely answers the description of either, that every poet is partly a prophet, and every prophet something of a poet, need not make us

confuse the different functions of religion and poetry, and be dissatisfied with a poet when he does not profess to enunciate a creed or offer an intellectual solution of the problems of life.—There have been Prophet-Poets—some have written their 'Divine Comedies.' But Shakespeare is not one of these. He holds up the mirror to Nature, and shows all the wonder and beauty of life, its grandeur, its infinite possibilities, its sorrow and evil and its abrupt end in death. But it is Nature as it appears to the eye of the natural man. He makes no attempt to preach a religion—revealed or otherwise. Let me not be misunderstood. Shakespeare himself must have been an intensely religious man. He may never have gone to church and he was probably indifferent to the creeds and theological quarrels of his time; but it is hard to imagine him a sceptic—without any Theory of the Universe to satisfy his heart. It is impossible that such a man should have been swayed by any narrow superstition, harsh asceticism, intolerance, fanatical fierceness or perversion of any kind, whether in the way of orthodoxy or of free thought.

We cannot say whether he called himself a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. It is a matter of supreme indifference. But what this man practically lay to that great heart of his, what he knew for certain concerning his vital relations to this mysterious Universe, that is to say, that which was his real religion—if we could get at that, we should be getting something worth having. And something of it we can learn from reading his tragedies. For, it is impossible but that the picture he draws of life and death and the mystery of things was profoundly influenced by his deepest Faith. Beyond this assurance, however, that Shakespeare must have had a religion and that it must have been deep and real and broad enough to take account of his tragic view of life, we know nothing: for throughout his writings he sternly and resolutely keeps a purely secular attitude. He presents the mystery of death, and makes us feel its full significance, but he never gives us a solution, perhaps, we may assert, never even points in the direction where a solution may be found.

It is my purpose in this paper to set about the discovery of the view which Shakespeare took of the tragic fact in life—taking King Lear as my text, but not confining myself to that play where it is necessary to scan a wider field. I wish to elucidate Shakespeare's view of the tragic fact in *life*. This will not necessarily be the same thing as his presentation of the tragic fact on the

stage. As an artist Shakespeare would of course be bound to consider dramatic effect and effectiveness, and we must use our own judgment in distinguishing, if we can, between the essential and the non-essential, the fact itself and the staging of it. It is obvious, for instance, that Shakespeare does not insist that in real life all people speak in the sublimest of blank verse when under the stress of emotion. I have to point this out, as there is, I think, a tendency among critics to rate what appear to me non-essentials, as if they were of the very essence of Shakespeare's view of tragedy. To take an example, every tragic hero in Shakespeare is 'great' in worldly position. Lear is a king, and it is clear enough from an artistic standpoint why he should be so. The fall from his high estate to that awful night when he was fain to hovel him with swine and rogues forlorn in short and musty straw produces a sense of contrast which could not otherwise be produced and it is, therefore, necessary for the poet to make him a king.

But I do not for a moment believe that Shakespeare thought that the tragedy of *life* is in any way affected to the *sufferer* by his rank or position. From the spectator's point of view it is true that that which was a sight most pitiful in the meanest wretch was past speaking of in a king. This sentiment Shakespeare puts into the mouth of an attendant gentleman—a mere voice in the chorus. For Cordelia at her father's bedside, the tragedy of her father's pitiful condition is in no way the contrast with his king's estate. It is the lovelessness of her sisters, the craving for love and forgiveness from the daughter he has wronged, that calls forth the warm tears of her who loves most and is therefore nearest the heart of Lear. In speaking then of the tragic fact as seen by Shakespeare, I should be as little inclined to mention the fact that his heroes occupy positions of worldly greatness as to state the no less important fact that they speak in verse. These are both necessary enough considerations when we discuss the artistic machinery of the play, but they are neither of them essential to the reality of tragedy. Nor do I think that Shakespeare imagined that the tragedy of life is only felt by those whose *nature* is exceptional. Lear is not merely a king. He is remarkable as a man. His character is built on the grand scale. His forcefulness whether in love or in passion is huge and overwhelming. He has in common with all Shakespearean heroes a big soul; and like all these heroes he has a peculiar bent of mind, an emotional predisposition which mark him out as a genius—one of whom, rather

than of the average, Nature might stand up and say to all the world 'This was a man.' He is big that our attention may be drawn to him: and he is big also, as I might easily show, for the purpose of the plot. He reminds us of the old blind Samson, whose mighty force was necessary to bring down the house of the Philistines and include in one act of overwhelming ruin both his enemies and himself. But we do not feel that his bigness in any way separates him from mankind. He is rather the stage type and exemplar of our common humanity, that, in the ordinary humdrum of life, acts and in acting sets loose a whole army of unknown evil forces, suffers and dies. In our mean world, we petty men too have our life-tragedies, exhibit our heroisms, suffer and die.

I propose now to leave any further consideration of what those elements in Shakespearean tragedy are which may fairly be ascribed to the artistic instinct rather than to any sentiment as to the tragic fact in itself. But do not let it be supposed that I depreciate the 'art' of the poet. The worldly greatness of Lear, the bigness of his heart, the strange way in which dramatic events in this play follow one another, have just the opposite effect to that which may be supposed. They carry us off, it is true, to a land of Nowhere, that is not, and never was nor shall be, but that Nowhere is truer than life. We see our own petty cases of tragedy universalised, stripped of conventions and stupidities, and impressed with that real significance which *we* can only doubly feel but the *poet* knows how to utter. I think, however, a reader in search of Shakespeare's view of the tragic in real life must—however difficult the task—be continually on the watch against allowing Shakespeare the artist to hide, rather than to elucidate, Shakespeare the thinker.

The questions we have to answer are these:—What is the meaning of Suffering and Death? What do they tell us of man? What do they tell us of God? Or rather—we are in search of Shakespeare's answers to these questions. Let us first see what part Shakespeare gives to man in the production of the calamities that attack him. Without any hesitation we may at once say that he makes the individual man 'responsible.' His own deeds form an integral portion of the cause of the catastrophe that overwhelms him. He is not *solely* responsible—the actual part he plays may be a small one. But, to some extent at least, what he suffers results from what he does. This is true even of characters like Ophelia in Hamlet, or Cordelia in Lear. And of the hero in every

case it is quite obviously so. I think, if we were to consider Mankind as one vast society of persons, the actual measure of pain inflicted on mankind might be found to correspond with some rough degree of justness to the actions of mankind. Shakespeare does not indeed suggest such a correspondence: but he does at least shew that human action is the vastly preponderating element in the cause of all human pain. Cordelia's suffering is out of all proportion to the part she herself plays in producing it. But vicariously she is bearing on her shoulders the result of King Lear's foolish whim in dividing up his kingdom, and of the cruelty of her sisters.—Unexplained chance is an element in the result. It is pure bad luck that Edmund delays so long to tell of the order he has issued for the hanging of Cordelia that, when he does tell it, it is too late to save her. But even this chance rises out of human character. Edmund, selfish in his life, means in his dying to do some good, despite of his own nature,—but his thoughts even then stray to Goneril and Regan, and to his own ambitions centred round their love for himself. His nature is too strong for him, and the delay therefore occurs, as we may say, naturally.

There is, however, besides the element of chance which plays a comparatively unimportant part in King Lear, another feature of tragedy which Shakespeare emphasises with special force in this play. Human suffering may be to a large extent the result of human action. We may even say that there are indications that the totality of human suffering is equated by the totality of human action. But, at any rate, man is helpless to guide the course of action. "Our thoughts are ours, their ends none of our own." Our thoughts find form in action, the results of which are altogether incalculable. Lear, fond and foolish, generously divides his kingdom between his daughters. Who could have thought that they could have been such fiends as to treat, as they did, the father who gave them all? Suppose he had acted otherwise. Suppose he had retained his royal power, and they had never had the opportunity of practising their cruelties. The hell-flood which was let loose upon himself and a wider world was the result of an ill-considered whim, an intention never very prudent, a sudden passionate change of plan. Suppose the dam had remained intact. But directly we attempt to make the supposition we see that it means altering character, Lear's character or Cordelia's character or both,—and more. The result of action is incalculable. But action itself is the direct outcome of charac-

ter under circumstances which are themselves mainly produced by character. However little, then, we may be able to foresee the result of what we do, however far chance may upset all human calculation, however vast may be the field over which effects are felt, however little what an individual suffers may be conceived in the deed for which he suffers, we can not rise from the study of a Shakespearean tragedy without a keen sense of human responsibility. And this statement is as true of King Lear as of any other of the tragedies. Some critics have supposed King Lear to be mad in the very first scene of the play. If this be so, however pathetic the tale of his sufferings might be, we should lose at once that sense of human responsibility which predominates in every other play. But I think the play speaks strongly enough for itself—that this supposition is wrong, and I need not labour the point. But there can be no doubt that, while Lear is in no way on a smaller scale than other Shakespearean heroes, yet even from the very beginning, or at least after the first act, we feel more strongly than in any other case that he is a man more sinned against than sinning. I suppose the strength of this sentiment is due to his great age, fourscore years and upwards, to the fact that he has suddenly stripped himself of all his power, and driven away those that love him, and is at the mercy of his heartless daughters, and finally to the fact that he early goes mad. But this sentiment is likely to lead us astray unless we keep in remembrance that first scene, where Lear's overpowering force predominates and literally creates the conditions out of which the tragedy arises.

Having in some measure appreciated the responsibility of man as an actor as well as a sufferer in the tragic world, let us turn to the further question. What is the nature of the power behind the world, that allows suffering and death to exist? This appears at first sight to be a 'religious' question, and I have already stated that Shakespeare makes no attempt to solve religious questions. But the question can easily be treated in two different aspects. In one aspect we are asking what the purpose and end of all the suffering is, what is the far off divine event to which humanity is groaning and labouring. That is the strictly religious aspect, and to the question in that aspect Shakespeare gives no answer—possibly no hint of answer. But in another aspect we are asking how the ultimate power of the universe manifests itself in the world of man? Or rather, we are asking the still

narrower question: what do the facts of suffering and death and evil reveal to us of the character of the ultimate power? We are ignoring for the time His revelation in the abundance of joy and life of which this world is full. We are concentrating our attention on Sin and Sorrow and Decay. We are forgetting Vishnu and trying to understand Siva. As I have said before, the God of love is no puzzle to us. It is the Devil we wish to explain.

And here Shakespeare helps us. But his answer is not a philosophical creed. It is not, in the narrow sense of the word, intellectual. We shall get the purport of his message in no terms of pure reason, but by the emotions which a close study of the tragedy of King Lear calls forth. And this is no easy task. For we are in continual danger of allowing our preconceived religious attitude colour the whole picture. Warned, however, of this danger, let us seek Shakespeare's answer. We shall not expect consistency—for it is only a partial aspect of this strange life of ours that is being examined, and in any case the Poet does not attempt a final solution—but we shall rightly expect a deep insight into the hidden reality of things as they are.

What, then, are the emotions which we feel when we have fully appreciated this tragedy? On the one hand, are they not Pity and Fear? On the other, are they not something akin to Satisfaction—satisfaction not of intellect nor of the conscience but of the heart, called forth partly by the heroism and love of Lear and Cordelia, and partly by a sentiment that the ultimate power is nearer in nature to that heroism and love than to the heartlessness and cruelty of Goneril and Regan. And above all, is there not a sense of deep unexplained mystery? Let us examine the facts more closely.—From our human standpoint we cannot hold the gods to be either just or benevolent. What has Lear committed that he should have for daughters such incarnations of the Devil as Goneril and Regan? Throughout the play Shakespeare insists on the unredeemed blackness of their characters and deeds. They have neither of them a saving quality of virtue. What can we think of the governance of a world in which the gods permit them to spread so far and wide misery and destruction, and in which for so long they thrive and prosper? What, when the end comes, have they suffered in comparison with the long agony of Lear or Cordelia?—It is quite obvious that in Shakespeare's tragic world, there is no equating of reward to desert, or penalty to crime. We may possibly find some hardness in Cordelia's

refusal to satisfy her father's whim and declare her love for him in public. Her virtue is too stiff and unbending. But does she deserve for this the anguish she suffered from the contemplation of her father's misfortunes? Does she deserve her death?—Again, what was it that put into Lear's mind the one course of action which alone could have led to such misery as it did? Why should not the wilfulness of his old-age have taken any other shape than that of giving away his kingdom?—How is it, too, that such chance as influences the final result should have worked against Lear and Cordelia instead of for them? The story might have at least ended happily and the previous suffering been almost forgotten, if Albany had arrived on the battle-field just *before* instead of just *after* Edmund ordered the hanging of Cordelia.—But perhaps the element in tragedy that most appals us, knocks away any last hope of satisfying answer, when we ask how the gods can be good—in any human understanding of the word, is the part which Virtue plays in producing catastrophe. If Cordelia could only have been a little less virtuous, if she could have stooped to compete with her sisters in protestations! She need have said nothing untrue! But her sense of truth is so delicate that it will not allow her to say a word in competition with her sisters' lies. In ten thousand situations she would have stood by her father, but here the one situation arises in which almost any one else would not have failed him, but she is compelled by her love and her truth, that is, by the very virtue of her nature to desert him. In the same scene, too, it is Kent's high sense of loyalty that drives him to face the dragon in his wrath and so to earn his banishment; and thus the catastrophe that follows becomes inevitable. Suppose Kent had been a little more self-seeking? Then again, Lear's own fond—if foolish—affection for his daughters it is, that is one of the main motives in determining him to divide his kingdom. This strong love of Lear is very marked throughout the play and is a leading cause of the madness that follows when that love is met by ingratitude.

I cannot help thinking, then, that feelings of rebellion or despair are produced by dwelling on certain aspects of the tragic fact as revealed by Shakespeare. In the words of Gloster we might say:

> "As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods;
> They kill us for their sport."

Or perhaps, with less inclination to personify the powers of

the universe, we might suppose some cold, bloodless, impersonal Fate at the back of phenomena—indifferent to human weal and woe, indifferent to right and wrong—sure, inevitable, working out a purposeless purpose, without even the grace to enjoy our miseries—mere Blank Necessity.

> "It is the stars,
> The stars above us, govern our condition."

If we took up either of these attitudes, that of hopelessness or of defiance, should we be true to Shakespeare? Mr. Swinburne seems to think so, for in comparing Shakespeare's 'Lear' to the 'Prometheus' and 'Orestes' of the Greek tragedian Aeschylus he says: "To Prometheus the fetters of the lord and enemy of mankind were bitter; upon Orestes the hand of heaven was laid too heavily to bear; yet in the not too utterly infinite or everlasting distance we see beyond them the promise of the morning on which mystery and justice shall be made one; when righteousness and omnipotence at last shall kiss each other. But in the horizon of Shakespeare's tragic fatalism we see no such twilight of atonement, such pledge of reconciliation as this. Requital, redemption, amends, equity, explanation, pity and mercy, are words without a meaning here.

> 'As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods;
> They kill us for their sport.'

Here is no need of the Eumenides, children of Night everlasting; for here is very Night herself.

The words just cited are not casual or episodical; they strike the keynote of the whole poem, lay the keystone of the whole arch of thought. There is no contest of conflicting forces, no judgment so much as by casting of lots: far less is there any light of heavenly harmony or of heavenly wisdom, of Apollo or Athene from above. We have heard much and often from theologians of the light of revelation; and some such thing indeed we find in Aeschylus; but the darkness of revelation is here."

I have quoted this long and eloquent passage from Mr. Swinburne's 'Study of Shakespeare,' as the expression of a poet's view—but I venture to think that it can be a final expression of the feelings which King Lear produces on our hearts, only if we ignore other elements in the play which lead to a different conclusion.

King Lear is fuller than any other of the tragedies of allusions to the ultimate powers in the universe. Many of the charac-

ters express their opinions of the gods, and some of these differ radically from these of Gloster and Kent which I have already quoted. Edgar suffers in his own person as much as any of the minor characters in the tragedy, and he is present at many of the most tragic moments that occur to others. But his faith in the dearest gods never wavers. He is ever buoyant and hopeful, always sees the best side of things, never despairs, and when the final catastrophe comes, he is left with the somewhat colourless Albany to sustain the gored State. We have a sort of feeling that his smallness and narrowness help him through with his difficulties, and his religiousness is too easy to satisfy us, but at least here is one character who lives through the blackness of the night and yet puts trust in the morning. If we have appreciated, as he apparently did not, the tenor of the tragic events that have passed, we cannot accept his easy solution of life, but the very fact of his persistent cheerfulness encourages us to believe that Shakespeare did not intend us to carry away so black an impression of the tragic fact as Mr. Swinburne has depicted.

Again, several others of the characters are confident of the justice of the gods. Speaking of the cruelty of Lear's daughters Gloster says, "but I shall see the winged vengeance overtake such children." One of Cornwall's servants cries out of his master,

"I'll never care what wickedness I do,
If this man come to good."

and another, speaking of Regan,

"if she live long
And in the end meet the old course of death
Women will all turn monsters."

Albany, when he hears of Cornwall's death, exclaims

"This shows you are above,
You justicers, that these our nether crimes
So speedily can venge."

And when they tell him of the death of Regan and Goneril,

"This judgment of the heavens, that makes us tremble
Touches us not with pity."

Even Edmund assents to the moralising of Edgar when he declares

"The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us."

and adds to it his own comment

"The wheel is come full circle; I am here"

that is, at point of death in consequence of his crimes. And Shakespeare completely justifies this confidence of his characters in the vengeance that overtakes evil and evil-doers. For, at the end of this play, as in all of his tragedies, none of those who have acted wickedly survive. Goneril, Regan, Cornwall, Oswald, Edmund all come to violent ends. We cannot say then that Shakespeare depicts the ultimate power of the universe as completely indifferent to questions of right and wrong.—Rather we might assert that evil is so repugnant to the divine economy that in its convulsive efforts to get rid of evil it drives good and evil together to one common end of destruction. Evil cannot endure and, in the greatness of its downfall, it carries with it much that is good. It is not merely, too, that evil is destroyed at the end. But in its very nature it is shown to be negative, barren, self-destructive. Goneril, Regan and Edmund are all playing each other false.—They have never any glad confidence in their prosperity; and must come to bad ends, whether an Edgar comes forth to accuse them or no.—Then, too, we must note that the *main* source of all the suffering to King Lear is the ingratitude of his daughters—that is, plain, bare, moral evil.—And further, that the catastrophe to himself could never be produced but by the imperfection of his character and the implication with his virtues of much evil, such as his head-strong passion and pride.—We are bound, then, to say at least this, that even if the Divine power is not just or benevolent from our human standpoint, it is obviously at enmity with evil.

But there is one aspect of the tragic fact specially emphasised in King Lear that not only redeems it from being a play of the blackest pessimism, but even gives it a claim to be reckoned among the most heart-strengthening, as it is universally considered to be the greatest, of Shakespeare's works. No play takes us deeper into the valley of gloom and darkness. There is nothing more pathetic than the struggle which Lear makes against his madness. The pathos is increased, as I have already shown, by the feeling that after his first wild action in ridding himself of power, he has very little control over the course of outward events. Whatever the cause, the story of the heroic effort he makes, when his fatherly love and kingly pride are met by ingratitude and disrespect, to keep his passion from overmastering his reason, wrings out the very last drop of our sympathy. The struggle and the effort are in vain. But it would be untrue to our genuine feelings,

I think, if I said we are left hopeless, heart-broken or desperate. If we are not, why is it so?

I think the reason is to be found partly in a persistent feeling that the struggle is not in vain. Lear loses his reason, it is true. But he gains that hardest of victories, a triumph over himself. It has been suggested that this play might be called, "The Redemption of King Lear"—and any one who reads and compares the Lear of the First Act with the Lear of the Fifth or the last scene of the Fourth, might with some show of reason claim that the play's truest lesson is the purification of virtue through suffering.

Even apart however from the grace of suffering, its burning and cleansing value, even if we look merely at the sharp, bitter anguish or the dull, lingering pain without a glance at such beneficent result as may be found, there is yet a certain triumph in the heroic build of one common humanity. Man may be beaten by the gods. But he is no mean creature. He can stand up to his punishment, and his fight is worth much, even were it to end, in fact, in the failure which to all appearance overwhelms him. Shakespeare is the champion of Man. We feel that Lear's agony is as nothing to his heroism and his love. Were we to have the choice, we would stand by Cordelia, suffer with her, die with her, if so we might partake in some measure of her pellucid goodness, rather than survive by the mean colourlessness of our nature with Albany. And this view of humanity has a reflex action on our view of the gods. However irreconcileable may be our ideas of omnipotence and love as applied to great Zeus, yet we are compelled by our own highest aspirations to believe that love after all is Life and God.

I make bold then to say that the disgust, the despair, or the rebellion to which certain aspects of Shakespearean tragedy would compel us, if taken alone, are transmuted by the other elements which we have just been considering to pity and fear. But, above all, there is a sense of mystery at the unexplained contradictions of life. Behind the struggle there must be a moral order with a Passion for Perfection—a passion so strong that it will not tolerate the least deviation from the strait path. In its war against evil, it destroys not only evil, but good as well. There is a moral order. But what about evil? Self-destructive, hated by the moral order it may be, but *it exists.* It, too, is part of the whole ultimate power of the universe. Shakespeare, the poet, offers no prophetic solution. He wrote no Divine Comedy. He does not assert

Eternal Providence or justify the ways of God to man. But he leaves us longing for a solution. He performs the poet's function of inspiring our dull minds to perceive the infinite significance of the Sphinx's question—teaches us to require a solution that will be big enough to include all the facts.

Shakespeare offers no solution, but our minds would be dul indeed if we came so far along the road with him and never asked whither he would bid us forward. We cannot but stand guessing what Shakespeare's religion was. Does he wish us to think that this world is too small a stage for the fullness of life, and that death is but the gate of a larger freedom? Did he believe that all the suffering of life, the battle and the blood, are such stuff as dreams are made of, and that our little life is rounded with a sleep? Or did he believe in the reality of suffering, think that in the Valley of the Shadow of Death God is with us more surely than when we stand upon the giddy heights of successful ambition or are swallowed up in the happy dreams of satisfied love? If he had any clearer insight than we lesser mortals into the significance of suffering and the end of our struggle, did he dare the bolder question which so far no religion has solved, of the necessity of it all? Why can Love—Almighty Love—find no other means to its end than Evil and Suffering and Death? We ask our questions, but Shakespeare is silent. He never revealed to the world his 'Theory of the Universe.' He wrote comedy, he wrote history, and he wrote tragedy. But he never wrote Religion. And Tragedy is the revelation of a world struggling to the light, but in its struggle increasing the darkness, and only winning its way to a final half-conquest by the destruction of good and evil alike.*

ARTHUR DAVIES.

THE KOOTANS OF COCHIN.

IN the order of social precedence, Kootans come next to Kanakkans. They are a small minority among the agricultural labourers of the State; at the last census they were returned as

* In this essay I owe a very deep debt to Mr. A. C. Bradley's 'Shakespearean Tragedy.' A reader of that book will recognise that many of my ideas are taken straight from there. I have even ventured to borrow wholly some of Mr. Bradley's phrases. Where I have been independent and taken a line of my own, sometimes even, I fear, in seeming opposition to Mr. Bradley's view, I have done so with a haunting apprehension that I am probably wrong.

numbering 99,—50 being males and 49 females. They speak Malayalam and are wholly illiterate. The names in common use among them are Mundan, Kandan, Cháthán, Kotha, Raman, Chakran, Chakkaye, Eriya and Kappiri; among women, Nili, Chakki, Kali, Kannachi.

They form one of the divisions of the slave castes, working under a landlord or farmer for the daily wages of an *Edangazhy* of paddy (worth ten pies) during the months of June, July and August, and two *Edangazhies* during the other months of the year. They get for the *Onam* and *Vishu* festivals a para of paddy (6 annas) some salt, cocoanut oil and chilies. On the day of the village festival every male member gets a *mundu* or two, and every female a *kacha* or two, in addition to toddy and arrack and other articles above referred to. They dress themselves in their small *mundus* and are treated to a sumptuous dinner. With shouts of joy they attend and take part in the village festival. When they fall ill, they are properly looked after by their masters, both on account of their good feelings towards them and also of the loss of work they may have to sustain, should they be laid up for a long time. Whenever a landlord or farmer has more men then he can afford to supply with work and wages, he generally lends their services to another on a *pattom* of four paras of paddy a year for a male, and three for a female. The new master gives them work and wages, and sends them back when they are no longer wanted. Should a Kootan run away from his master, he is brought back either by threat or mild words; should these fail, there is no remedy to force him back. In spite of the abolition of slavery some sixty years ago, they are in a state of bondage. In fact, they live in small huts with insufficient food and with nothing but a small *mundu* to dress themselves with, plodding on from day to day with no hope of improving their condition. They are found in the northern parts of the State especially in the *Talapally Taluk.*

Their huts are erected on four bamboo posts. They have thatched roofs and the sides are protected by mud walls or covered with palmyra leaves. A bamboo frame work covered with the same leaves serves the purpose of a door. There is also a verandah in front. They have a few earthen and bamboo utensils for domestic use. They often lie on bamboo mats with nothing to protect themselves against chill draughts during the rainy months. The inmates lie together in one room.

As among other classes of agrestic serfs, marriage does not exist among them. With persons who are connected with one another, all matrimonial alliances are avoided. Neither do they adopt the custom of mating with daughters of maternal uncles, which obtains in some places.

Girls are married generally after puberty, rarely before it. The terms 'marriage,' 'wife' and 'husband' cannot be strictly applied to their conjugal relations. They resort to *Sambandhom* like the Nayars. A Kootan who wishes to enter into a *sambandhom* with a woman of his own or of the Pulaya caste, goes to her hut with one or two of his relations or friends to recommend him to the parents of the woman to permit him to enter into conjugal relations with their daughter or form *kutikuduka*. With their permission either expressed or implied, they become a kind of husband and wife. In most cases the will of the man and the woman is sufficient for the union. He has nothing to give her except the paddy which he gets as wages, when he goes to her so as to save her the trouble of feeding him then. Working for a master from morning till night, watching his fields during night and hardly getting two annas worth of paddy to maintain himself, he has no saving by which to purchase a cloth or ornament for his beloved. The woman generally stays with her parents in her hut and very often her lover comes to her with his wages after the day's hard work and stays with her for the night. Should she wish to accompany him to his hut she does so with her wages in the evening. The lover need not support his wife. The union is attended with no ceremony nor any expense. The service of a middleman, the ceremony of match-making are all dispensed with. The woman is no dependent of the lover.

Kootans are monogamists and their women are not polyandrous. Adultery is no social sin with them, nor is it regarded with abhorrence, for divorce is very easy. Widows may remarry and may even associate with their brothers-in-law.

The Kootans follow the Marumakkathayam law of inheritance. They have no property except sometimes a sheep or a few fowls. Children are the members of the mother's family. They have no tribal meeting, but all disputes, cases of theft and other offences are settled by their masters whose decisions are final. Culprits are thrashed but not fined.

They believe in magic and sorcery. Mannans and Muhammadan Moplas are sometimes consulted, and these dupe them.

They profess the lower forms of Hinduism and worship the local village deity (*Kali*) and the spirits of their ancestors whom they represent by means of stones placed on a raised floor under a tree, and to whom boiled rice, parched grain, husk, toddy, plantain fruits, and cocoanuts are offered on the *Vishu* and *Onam* festivals and on *Karkatakam*, *Thulam* and *Makara sankranties*. Care is always taken to have the offerings served separately on leaves, lest the beings reverenced should quarrel with one another and do them harm. Should illness such as cholera, small-pox or fever break out in a family some fowls with an anna or two, are offered to the goddess *Bhagavathy* in the temple close by, as she is believed to be able to save them from the impending calamity. They have no priests.

When a member of the caste breathes his last, his landlord, who is at once informed of the event, gives his relatives a spade to dig the grave for burial, an axe or knife for cutting wood to serve as fuel, if the corpse is to be burned, a piece of cloth, for covering the dead body and also some paddy and millet to meet the funeral expenses. A cocoanut, if obtained, is broken and placed on the neck of the dead body which is covered with the above piece of cloth and carried on a bier to the burial ground, which is sprinkled over with water mixed with turmeric. When the burial is over, the people who accompanied the funeral, including the relatives and friends of the deceased bathe and go to the latter's hut, where they are served with *kanji* and toddy, after which they depart. The members of the family and the close relatives of the deceased, fast for the night. In the case of a man dying, his nephew is the chief mourner, while, in that of a woman, her eldest son and daughter are the chief mourners, and do not go to work for two weeks, though the others cannot help going. The chief mourners bathe in the early morning, cook a small quantity of rice and offer it to the spirit of the dead. It is eaten up by the crows. This is continued for fourteen days and on the fourteenth night they all fast. On the fifteenth morning they regard themselves as having been cleansed from the pollution. All the castemen of the *kara* are invited. They bring with them rice, currystuffs and toddy. Their *Enangan* cleans and sweeps the hut while the rest go to the graveyard, turn the earth and make it level. They bathe and the *Enangans* sprinkle cow-dunged water on the grave. They return home and are treated to a sumptuous dinner, after which they all take leave of the chief mourner who observes the

Diksha, bathes in the early morning and offers the *Bali* (rice ball) before he goes to work. This he continues for the whole year, after which he gets shaved and celebrates a feast in honour of the dead. The pollution which they observe corresponds to that observed by their masters.

The Kootans are agricultural labourers and take part in every kind of work connected with agriculture, such as turning the soil, ploughing, sowing, manuring, weeding, transplanting and the like; and, as soon as the monsoon is over, they work in gardens, turning the soil, watering and fencing. Thus they work all the year round as directed by their masters. They are landless day labourers working for a small pittance from early morning till sunset, with the exception of an hour or two at midday. There are no hunters nor artisans among them. They go in for fishing at times.

They take rice *kanji* prepared the previous night with salt and chillies, either powdered or otherwise. They have some leisure at twelve o'clock during which they go to their huts and take *kanji*, prepared with a fish or two boiled in it, or sometimes with some vegetable curry. At night boiled rice or *kanji* with fish or curry made of vegetables from their kitchen-garden, forms their chief food. All their provisions for housing are bought by exchange of paddy from a petty shop-keeper in their vicinity. In times of famine, they are more than half starved. They eat the flesh of goats, fowls, monkeys, pigs, toads and quails, and abstain from the flesh of snakes, jackals, crocodiles, and vermin and from beef. They eat the leavings of people above them in rank, as also rancid or spoiled food.

As to status, they eat and drink at the hands of all castes except Parayan, Pulayan and Ullatan and Nayadi. In some parts of the State, they approach the houses of Izhuvas. No other castes eat with them. They have to keep themselves at a distance of forty-eight feet from all the high-caste Hindus. They are polluted by *Pulayas, Nayadis* and *Ullatans* who have to stand at some distance from them. They may take water from the wells of Moplas. They are their own barbers and washermen and may approach the temples of their village goddess *Kali* on some special days, while at other times, they have to stand far away.

The men wear a small *mundu* round their loins, and another small one as covering for their head. They are seldom seen with

a shoulder cloth. Their *mundus* are small and seldom extend beyond the knees. They wear ear-rings sometimes as many as three for each ear, use brass rings for the finger and shave their bodies clean, leaving no tuft of hair on their heads.

The women wear small *kachas* folded twice round the waist with no second cloth to cover their breasts. A few cf them whom I have seen were without ornaments. They wear necklaces of beads Their hair is dishevelled, the loose end being tied into a knot and placed on the top of the head slightly inclined towards the back.

The Kootans have no games of their own, but take part in the village festivals. The women have no games. They are rather short in stature and dark in colour. They are socially superior to Pulayas, and are a very quiet-going set of people.

L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SOUTH INDIA AND CEYLON.

From the first Tamil Invasion of the Island to the Reign of King Vijaya Bahu of Ceylon.—III.

Kassapa V. was succeeded by Dappula IV, and he, within a year, by Dappula V [918—930.] At this time the Pandyan King, perhaps Rajasimha himself, driven out from his country, arrived in Ceylon to solicit the help of Dappula V. He was well received and preparations were made for an invasion of the continent. But a civil war breaking out in Ceylon, the Pandyan King found that further stay in the island was useless. He then entrusted the King of Ceylon with "his crown and other apparel" and left for Kerala.* A peculiar importance seems to have been attached to this crown, perhaps because it was an heirloom of the Pandyan dynasty. It was captured and re-captured several times in the course of the Chola-Singhalese war; and I shall try to prove later that it is to this crown that Rajendra Chola alludes when in his inscriptions he claims to have captured from the Singhalese :—

"முன்னவர் பக்கல்தென்னவர் வைத்த சுந்தரமுடியும் இந்திரனாரமும்."

In the reign of Udaya III. † the Chola King who "desired to take to himself the dominions of the whole Pandu Country," sent

---

* Wijesinha's *Mahavamsa*, p. 82.

† *Ibid.*, p. 84.

emissaries to the Singhalese Court demanding the surrender of "the crown and the rest of the apparel that the King of Pandu left there when he fled." Udaya refused to give them up, and the Chola King thereupon invaded Ceylon and forcibly took possession of the objects of contention. Udaya retreated to Malaya whither the enemy pursued him. But being unable to reduce the mountainous south, the invader turned towards India "leaving the island in great fear." Viduragga, the Singhalese Commander, now attacked the borders of the Chola dominions and recovered the Pandyan heirlooms.

The Chola King who undertook this invasion was, perhaps, Rajaditya * the successor of Parantaka I. If so, the invasion of Ceylon should have taken place before 950 A. D., for we learn from the Atakur inscription † that Rajaditya was dead by Saka 872. He had lost his life fighting the Rashtra-kutas who were now absorbing large portions of Chola dominions. The five successors ‡ of Rajaditya before Raja Raja had enough to do with maintaining their own independence. It is not probable that they undertook any invasion of Ceylon. If we follow the chronology of the Pujavaliya, Udaya III. in whose time these events happened, ruled between 942 and 950 A. D., that is, he was exactly a contemporary of Rajaditya. Hence, it is probable that Rajaditya invaded Ceylon some years before 950, the year of his death. The Mahavamsa gives for Udaya III. the dates 964—972 and thus continues its chronological discrepancy of about twenty-five years.

Under the feeble successors of Parantaka I. the Chola dynasty suffered from a temporary eclipse from which it emerged with the accession of Raja Raja to the throne. The scarcity of Chola inscriptions between the reigns of Parantaka I. and Raja Raja, goes far to show the decaying condition of this great Tamil kingdom. For a while it became with the Cholas a struggle for existence itself, the victorious arms of the Rashtrakutas being carried to the very gates of Kanchipuram and Tanjore §. The Rashtrakuta kingdom attained the climax of its greatness about this time; and Krishna III. overran all South India, brought about the death of Rajaditya

* The large Leyden grant published in Vol. IV of "*The Archæological Survey of Southern India.*"

† *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, p. 167.

‡ The large Leyden grant.

§ *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. III, pp. 283—285.

Chola *, and penetrated even into Ceylon. The Karhad plates of Krishna III. † [Saka 880 or A. D. 959] published by Dr. Bandharkar, besides mentioning the subjugation of the Chola power speak of an invasion of Ceylon. When the Chola power was destroyed, when Tanjore and Kanchi the chief cities of Cholamandalam were in the possession of the Conquerors, when the Pandyan kingdom had become powerless through its long wars with the Cholas, then indeed the Rashtrakutas were all-powerful in the South and it was a task of no great difficulty to attempt an invasion of Ceylon. In a single verse the Karhad plates sum up the course of the Rashtrakuta invasion southwards :

"Having, with the intention of subduing the southern region, uprooted the races of the Cholas, given their lands to his own dependants, and made the lords of great countries, namely, the Cheranma, the Pandya and others, along with the Simhala, his tributaries, he erected a high column at Rameswara . . ."

That this mention of the invasion of Ceylon was no mere empty boast may be learnt by referring to the Mahavamsa. In the reign of King Mahinda IV, ‡ "Vallabha" sent an army to conquer Ceylon. But Sena, the Singhalese general, is said to have destroyed the Indian army, and Vallabha, unable to conquer Ceylon, concluded a treaty with Mahinda. It appears to me that this Vallabha is no other than Krishna III. of the Rashtrakutas. We know that by 950 A. D. Rajaditya was assassinated, and even Tanjore had been invested and taken by Krishna III. The Rashtrakutas were undoubtedly the strongest power at the time, and, as such, the best fitted to undertake the conquest of the island kingdom. But this by itself does not prove anything. The name "Vallabha," however, taken along with the above circumstances, proves that the invader of Ceylon was not a Tamil sovereign. "Vallabha" is a name we meet with in the case of Chalukya Kings; it was a common title with them. When, about Saka 679, the Chalukya Kirtivarman II. was supplanted by the Rashtrakutas, Dantidurga Rashtrakuta was considered to have become the lord paramount by vanquishing "Vallabha"§. On the extinction of the original Chalukya dynasty the Rashtrakutas stepped

---

* *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. II, p. 167, and Vol. III, p. 175.

† *Ibid*, Vol. IV, pp. 279—280.

‡ Wijesinha's *Mahavamsa*, p. 85. *Vide* also the Addenda et Corrigenda to that work.

§ *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. II, p. 375.

into the place of the Chalukyas and "appear clearly to have assumed the title of Vallabha which was used by their predecessors" * And to make the conviction stronger that the "Vallabha" of the Mahavamsa is identical with the Rashtrakuta, Krishna III. who claims to have exacted tribute from Ceylon we find from verse 35, line 53 of the Karhad plates, that Krishna III. was also known as "Akalavarsha deva Prithvivallabha" and "Vallabha-Narendra deva."

There are some slight chronological difficulties here. According to the Mahavamsa, the invasion should have taken place between 975 and 991.† While the Pujavaliya gives to Mahinda IV. the dates 962—978.‡ Since we learn from the Atakur inscription that Rajaditya died in or before 950 A.D., it is likely that it was after this date that his conqueror, Krishna III, undertook the expedition to Ceylon. The Karhad plates which mention this invasion are dated Saka 880 [A.D. 959.] Hence, according to the Indian inscriptions, the invasion should have taken place between 950 and 959. The dates of the Mahavamsa are too late, because they take us well into the times of the great Chola conqueror, Raja Raja, [984—1013] and also because the Rashtrakuta power was crushed by Taila II. of the Western Chalukyas *before* 975 A.D. Hence, we may assume that the dates of the Mahavamsa are again incorrect by about twenty-five years. The Pujavaliya is more correct.

The last quarter of the tenth century saw again the rise of the Chola power under Raja Raja, one of the greatest kings of the dynasty. With him commenced a series of wars which brought all South India and Ceylon for a time under the Chola sway. The most brilliant epoch in the history of the Chola Empire commenced with him, and to him is due its inauguration.

The date of Raja Raja has now been more or less definitely fixed; he appears to have reigned from 984 to 1013 A.D.§ Sir Walter Elliot,‖ and Dr. Burnell ¶ assigned to him the dates 1023—1064, but this is a mistake; as Dr. Hultzsch has conclusively shown,** Elliot and Burnell confused Raja Raja Chola with

* Bhandarkar's *Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 209.

† See Chronological Table of Sovereigns in Wijesinha's *Mahavamsa*, p. 22.

‡ *Ibid*, p. 54.

§ *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXIII, p. 297; *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IV, p. 68.

‖ *Coins of Southern India*, p. 131.

¶ *South Indian Palaeography*, p. 40.

** *Ibid*, Vol. I, p. 63.

his Eastern Chalukya grandson, Raja Raja, and assigned to the elder the dates of the younger. Accepting the new dates, we find that Raja Raja invaded Ceylon about 1004 A.D. * At that time Mahinda V. was reigning in Ceylon. He found it difficult to keep under control the rebellious elements of the population, especially the Tamils; taxes did not come in; and the mercenary soldiers of "Kerala" whose wages were in arrears, rose against the King in the twelfth year of his reign (about 1000 A.D.) [The date here adopted is that of the Pujavaliya which generally agrees with the South Indian inscriptions in its dates after the eighth century. The Mahavamsa, as has already been shown, differs much from these, but its narrative has a striking similarity to what we gather from Indian sources.] Finding it impossible any longer to keep up his authority in Anuradhapura, the King fled to Rohana, while "the Keralas, the Sihalas, and the Kannatas exercised full authority at that time in the other parts" of the island. The story goes that a trader in horses arrived in Ceylon, and that, on his return home, he informed the Chola King of the anarchy in Ceylon. On hearing this, the Chola at once sent an army which "arrived in Lanka without delay, and, by slow degrees, entered the Rohana, oppressing the people as they went." Thus Raja Raja invaded Ceylon at a time when the country was weakened by internal dissensions, and the fugitive island King could offer but poor resistance to the powerful invader. The war between Raja Raja and Mahinda was continued into the reign of Raja Raja's son, Rajendra-Choladeva. The inscriptions of this King (dated the 6th year of his reign†) distinctly refer to the conquest of Ceylon. Hence, it is probable that he invaded the island about the fifth year of his reign, that is, about 1017-1018 A. D. Now, according to the Mahavamsa, the war lasted on till, in the thirty-sixth year of Mahinda's reign, he was taken prisoner. This means that Mahinda was taken prisoner in 1037 A. D. if the date of the Mahavamsa be true, which is, however, improbable since the sixth year of Rajendra Chola, when he claims to have subdued Ceylon, will not carry us further than 1018 A. D. The Pujavaliya, however, says that Mahinda's reign commenced in 988, adding 36 years to this, as required by the Mahavamsa we get for

* An Inscription of the 20th year of Raja Raja contains the earliest reference to the conquest of Ceylon. See *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III, part I., pp. 106—107.

† *Ibid*, Vol. II, part I, pp. 90-91.

Rajendra Chola's conquest of Ceylon the year 1024 which makes a nearer approach to the date of the inscription.

The Pandyan crown which, as we have seen, had already formed the object of contention between the Cholas and the Singhalese, seems to have now finally passed into the possession of the Cholas. Rajendra Chola claims to have captured "the crown of the King of Ilam in the rough sea, the exceedingly beautiful crown of the Queen and the King of that (country); the Sundara-crown and the Indra—necklace which the King of the South (*i.e.*, Pandya) had formerly *entrusted* to him (the King of Ceylon)* the whole Ila-Mandalam (Ceylon) on the transparent sea." Dr. Hultzsch has, I venture to think, mis-translated "முன்னவர் பக்கல்த்தென்னவர் வைத்த சுந்தரமுடியும் இந்திரனாரமும்" into "the crown of Sundara, which the King of the South (*i e.*, the Pandya) had formerly given to that (King of Ilam); the pearl necklace of Indra." Commenting on this passage he observes†: "The King of the South is the Pandya King. Of him the inscription says that he had formerly given the crown of Sundara to the King of Ceylon, from whom Rajendra Chola took that crown of Sundara. The name, Sundara, occurs in the traditional lists of the Pandya Kings. In the present inscription, the term 'the crown of Sundara' seems to be used in the sense of 'the crown of the Pandya King,' and the composer of the historical part of the inscription seems to have known Sundara as a former famous member of the Pandya dynasty. But no conclusion as to the date of Sundara can be drawn from this mention of his name, the names of the Pandya King who was conquered by the King of Ceylon, and of the King of Ceylon who was conquered by Rajendra Chola, are not mentioned." Comparing the Tamil original of this inscription with certain portions‡ of the Mahavamsa to which I have already referred, I am led to think that "Sundaramudi" does not mean the crown *of* (King) Sundara, and that the inscription does not allude to any conquest of the Pandyas by the Singhalese. We have already seen how, early in the tenth century, a Pandyan king, probably Rajasimha driven out of his kingdom by the Cholas, sought shelter in Ceylon; how "he left his crown and other apparel" with the King of Ceylon, and left for Kerala, how

---

* *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. I., p. 98.

† *Ibid*. Vol. I, p. 99.

‡ Those referring to the Pandyan heirlooms.

in the time of Udaya III, a Chola, probably Rajaditya, seized these Pandyan heirlooms, and how they were soon after recovered by the Singhalese general, Viduragga. The Singhalese and the Pandyans were allies from the middle of the ninth century, and they continued as such till a much later time. When driven from his home, the Pandyan king entrusted his royal insignia to the King of Ceylon as his best friend and ally. Remembering these facts, and remembering how short a time before Rajendra Chola's accession these events happened, I should translate "வைத்த" into "entrusted", and should consider "சுந்தரமுடி" to be the name proper of the Pandyan crown called after the Pandyan family deity, Soma-Sundara. Again, if 'Sundara' is to be considered to mean a King called Sundara, consistency of argument requires that Indra should also represent a King of that name. And who was that Indra? and how did King Mahinda of Ceylon get possession of his necklace? I should think that "Indiranaram" was merely the name of a necklace, an heirloom of the Pandyan dynasty called after Indra; and this is borne out by the following passage from the Chilappathikaram:—

"செங்கணு யிரத்தோன் றிறல் விளங்காரம்
பொங்கொளி மார்பிற் பூண்டோன் வாழி."

"Long live he (the Pandyan) who wears on his resplendent chest the brilliant necklace of (named after) the thousand-red-eyed (Indra)."

The story of the fortunes of the Pandyan crown is clearly stated in the Mahavamsa, and a literal translation of Rajendra-chola's inscriptions fully bears out the account given in the Singhalese chronicle.

* The Tamils now occupied all the important places, Anuradhapura and Pulahatti included, and Mahinda was sent "straight away to the King of Chola." Prince Vikrama Bahu, the heir to the throne, escaped to Rohana. Thither the Cholas pursued him and ravaged the Southern country from one end to the other. This is the first time we hear of the Tamils penetrating into the Southern districts which had always remained to the island kings as a place of refuge in times of danger. But, after fighting for six months the Tamils retreated to Pulahatti. The northern portion of the island remained in their possession, and

* The *Mahavamsa* describes the war in detail, pp. 91-101 in Wijesinha's edition. The *Rajavali* and the *Pujavaliya* have brief notices.

they frequently raided the southern country which was in a state of complete political and military disorganization. Vikrama Bahu who wisely refused to be crowned king of a country that was in the occupation of the enemy, died after a nominal reign of twelve years; and his death was the cause of civil strife. His successors, till Vijaya Bahu, were short-lived adventurers either Singhalese or Indian; and they all tried to keep up the unequal fight against the Cholas. Kitti, a general, tried to become king. He was slain by Mahalana Kitti who was himself overthrown by the Cholas. The next was Vikrama Pandu. His name seems to point out a Pandyan origin for him. From what a contemporary record—an inscription of Rajadhi Raja*—says, we learn that he was one "who, having lost the whole of the southern Tamil country which had previously belonged to him had entered Ilam." This testifies to the existence of the Pandya-Singhalese alliance which was operative throughout the long wars between the Cholas and the Singhalese. Raja Raja, Rajendra Chola and his successor Rajadhi Raja repeatedly overran Madura and deprived the "Seriyas" first "of their splendour," † and then of their independence. The Pandyan Kingdom was now practically included in the Chola Empire; and Pandyan princes were found fighting in the Singhalese ranks.

Vikrama Pandu was slain by Jagatipala, a prince of Ayodhya, and he lost his life in fighting against the Cholas. Then came Parakrama, 'a son of the Pandyan king'; and the Cholas made away with him too. He was succeeded by Lokeswara, another foreigner; and the next to play at royalty was a Singhalese officer, Kassapa. Meanwhile, the Singhalese were gathering round the young Prince Kitti, a descendant of Mahinda V. This lad of only sixteen was destined to be the deliverer of his country. He defeated the forces of Kasappa and proceeded to assume the crown under the title of Vijaya Bahu. Thus, the period between the capture of Mahinda V. and the accession of Vijaya Bahu [1065] saw the Cholas undisputed masters of the northern half of the island, and saw them also making repeated attacks on Rohana. The Singhalese in the extreme south were fighting among themselves and maintaining a precarious independence—if that may be called inde-

* *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol III., Part I., p. 54.

† See Inscriptions of Raja Raja.

pendence which was subjection to the tyranny of usurpers not infrequently of foreign birth. The Chola Inscriptions throw considerable light on this period of Ceylonese history.

The Chola Empire was now in the noon-time of its glory. From the time of Raja Raja it had been steadily growing in power and extent, and Rajadhi Raja who ordered the campaigns against Rohana appears to have been a great conqueror. From astronomical calculations Professor Kielhorn has shown that Rajahdi Raja was crowned [perhaps as Yuvaraja] in 1018 A. D., and that his reign lasted till 1050 A. D. * According to a Manimangalam inscription† of his he deprived four Ceylonese kings of their crowns, and appointed his brothers and sons as Viceroys over the Cheras, the Chalukyas, the Pandyas, *the Singhalese*, the Pallavas and the inhabitants of Kanyakubja. The inscription gives the name of the Ceylonese kings defeated by him as Vikrama Bahu, Vikrama Pandi, Virasalamegan and Sri Vallabha Madanaraja. Of these, Vikrama Bahu, and Vikrama Pandi are also mentioned in the Chronicles. Virasalamegan was, according to the Inscription, a king of Kanyakubja (Kanauj) who, losing his kingdom, had obtained the crown of Lanka. As shown by Dr. Hultzsch ‡ he is the same as Jagatipala mentioned in the Mahavamsa as a prince of Ayodhya. The circumstances of the overthrow of both Jagatipala and Virasalamegan are more or less alike. For both a northern origin is given, and it is probable that Jagatipala claimed "to have sprung from the race of Rama" and to have "come from the city of Ayodhya" just to win popularity among the Singhalese. And lastly, Sri Vallabha Madanaraja is perhaps identical with Parakrama Pandu mentioned in the Mahavamsa as having been killed by the Cholas.

According to the calculations of Prof. Kielhorn Rajadhi Raja, should have ceased reigning about 1050 A. D. and Kulottunga Chola I, should have ascended the Chola throne in 1070 A. D.§ Hence Rajendra Deva, the hero of Koppam,‖ Raja Mahendra, ¶ Virarajendra, the victor of Kudal-Sangaman, ** and

* *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IV., p. 266.

† *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III., Part. I., p. 54.

‡ *Ibid.* Vol. III. Part. I., p. 53.

§ *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IV. p. 266.

‖ *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III., Part. I., pp. 60–63.

¶ *Ibid.* — „ p. 113.

** *Ibid.* — „ pp. 34—37.

Adhirajendra * should have held sway over Cholamandalam between 1050 and 1070. These were days when the Singhalese made repeated attempts to expel the Tamils, who, unable to reduce Rohana, kept firm possession of the northern portion of the island. An inscription of Rajendra Deva, † in the fourth year of his reign, says that he "despatched a warlike army into the southern region, captured in Lanka (surrounded by) the black ocean, Virasalamegan, the King of the Kalingas (who had) a powerful army ....and seized on the battle field the two sons of Manabharanan, the king of the people of Lanka." We have no means of settling the identity of these kings. Dr. Hultzsch has clearly shown ‡ that they could not have been the same as Manabharana and Kitti-Sirimegha who usurped the Ceylonese throne in 1121 and reigned till 1142.§ But the fact that Rajendra Deva's power extended to Ceylon is proved by Mr. H. C. P. Bell's discovery of an inscription of that Chola monarch at Sangili-Kandarava in Ceylon. ‖

During the reigns of the three Chola successors of Rajendra Deva, the Singhalese made vigorous attempts to regain their independence. The young Prince, Vijaya Bahu, whose accession was about 1065 A. D., ¶ began to make great preparations for the expulsion of the foreigners, but the Chola King, hearing this, ordered his general, resident in Pulahatti, to invade the South. Accordingly the Chola general entered Rohana and laid the country waste. Vijaya Bahu fled to a hill fort and from there entered into negotiations with the king of Ramanna.** At the same time the people in Raja Ratta became defiant and refused to pay up their taxes to the Cholas. The Chola King sent an army which invaded Rohana where it was joined by some Singhalese rebels. The King of Ceylon fortified Puluttha-Pabbata †† and from there kept up the war of independence. The Cholas invested the fort and were severely defeated. Vijaya Bahu followed up his victory by occupying Pulahatti. But the Chola King sent over a fresh army

* *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III., Part. I., pp. 113-114.

† *Ibid.* Vol. III., Part I., p. 58.

‡ *Ibid.* ,, ,, p. 59.

§ *Chronological Table of Sovereigns*, p. XXIII in Wijesinha's Mahavamsa.

‖ Mentioned in the *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. III., Part I., p. 39.

¶ The *Pujavaliya* and the *Mahavamsa* agree here.

** In Burma. Vide *Mahavamsa*. Ch. XXVI.; also the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXI, p. 377 and Vol. XXII, p. 327.

†† *Modern Pulutupana.*

which met the Singhalese in battle near Anuradhapura. The Singhalese are said to have won the day; but the country, instead of being freed, passed still further under the Chola yoke. Vijaya Bahu was obliged to retreat. After suppressing a rebellion in Rohana he again appeared before Pulahatti. A great battle was fought in which the Cholas were entirely defeated, and their king thinking it useless to send further reinforcements to Ceylon, gave up all attempts at conquering the island. Thus, having freed his country of the Tamil invaders, Vijaya Bahu entered Anuradhapura in the fifteenth year of his reign, *i.e.*, about 1080 A.D.

The Chola empire had meanwhile passed into the hands of the Eastern Chalukya Kings of Vengi. From the days of Raja Raja Chola, the Chola and the Eastern Chalukya royal families had freely inter-married, and on the death of the last of the Chola monarchs, the Eastern Chalukya King Kulottunga Chola Deva I. ascended the southern throne.* Thus the kings of Vengi succeeded to the Chola throne and to the wars of the Cholas with Ceylon. After Rajendra Deva the Chola Kings do not appear to have made any great attempt to bring the entire island of Ceylon under their sway, † and Kulottunga Chola Deva seems to have been destined to lose even that portion of the island which had been annexed to the Chola dominions by his predecessors. The dates assigned by the Ceylonese chronicles, Pujavaliya and Mahavamsa, to the invasion and defeat of the two great Tamil armies, fall entirely within the years during which Kulottunga reigned over the Chola dominions. ‡ That these dates should be approximately correct is clear from the fact that Kulottunga really sent two expeditions to Ceylon. The Kalingattu Parani which describes the conquest of Kalinga by Kurunakara Tondaiman, the feudatory Pallava king, refers also to a conquest of Ceylon by the same general of Kulottunga.§ And the Vikrama-cholan-ula ‖ also, in mentioning

---

* *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIX., p. 232; the Chellur grant in the *S.I.I.*, Vol. II., Part II; *Vikramankadevacharita*, Ch. vi., verse 22.

† An inscription of the 7th year of Virarajendra mentions an invasion of Ceylon: "தென்களைத்த(லை)கொ(ண்)டு சேரல(னை)த்திறைகொண்டு சிங்களதேசம் வடிப் படுத்து."

‡ *i.e.* after 1070 A.D. and before 1112., Vide *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. xxiii, p. 299 vol. ii, Part iii, p. 308; also *Mahavamsa*, Ch LVIII, verses 18 and 59.

§ "இலங்கை எறிந்த கருணாகரன்." Ch. ii, stanza 44.

"சிங்களத்தொடு தென்மதுராபுரி
செற்றகொற்றவன்" Ch. ix., stanza 19.

‖ *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXII., p. 149.

among the courtiers who attended on Vikrama Chola "the Tondaiman who, in a single campaign, scattered the armies of Malainadu, and defeated the Tennar (Pandyas), Maluwar, *Singalar*, Konkanar, and other Kings of distant lands," refers perhaps to the achievements of Kurunakara Tondaiman in the time of Vikrama Chola's predecessor Kulottunga, Chola Deva. We may suppose that the "conquest" of Ceylon is only a poetic flight. Instead of conquering the island, the Cholas were compelled to retire from Ceylon and the native dynasty was restored. An inscription of Kulottunga Chola Deva, published by Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai, says that the King's "fame was augmented by two campaigns in Singhalam.* " The clause is very vague; it cannot signify a conquest, for a conquest would have been painted in more glowing and unequivocal language. I suppose it only alludes to those two campaigns mentioned in the Mahavamsa, which began with brilliant prospects and ended disastrously to the Cholas.

Thus did Vijaya Bahu win back the freedom of Lanka and the Singhalese once again became masters of Anuradhapura. But this sanguinary struggle of over a century considerably weakened them, while it added nothing to the strength of the Chola Empire. The war was long and fierce, and its history is not bare of brilliant episodes and heroic achievements. Yet it did not, and could not, settle the question of the independence or subjection of the Singhalese. In the progress of the world national independence and territorial greatness are not eternal. The most civilized and the best organized states keep the supremacy, and they do so as long as a higher and more powerful type does not appear. The South Indians and the Singhalese continued their wars, but in the course of time it was their destiny alike to come into contact with nations much better organized. And alike they succumbed.

Centuries of close contact could not but influence the progress of the two countries. The religious institutions of Ceylon gradually passed under the influence of Hinduism, and Hindu temples came curiously enough to be attached to Buddhist viharas.† Frequent attempts were made to rid the island of all heresy and to exterminate the followers of Hinduism; ‡ yet Hinduism

* *Indian Antiquary*, vol. XXI., p. 281.

† Tennent's *Ceylon*, p. 356; *Ceylon Census Report*, 1901, p. 89.

‡ There are numerous instances in the Chronicles.

lingered on and permanently influenced the established religion of the island. The arrival of Tamil colonists, the frequent Tamil invasions, the employment of Tamil soldiers, and the growth of commerce with India, * all contributed their share to the partial commingling of the Indians and the Singhalese, and the evolution of a type of Buddhism not entirely opposed to Brahmanism. There was nothing strange in this Hindu influence on Buddhism; it was not entirely alien, for, as Bishop Coppleston says, " it was on a Hindu foundation that all the social systems of the Singhalese had been built, and this Buddhism has not destroyed." Hence, we are not surprised when Fa Hian tells us that the King of Ceylon whom he visited, performed Brahmanical purifications ; † nor are we surprised when the Mahavamsa mentions a King of Ceylon who feasted sumptuously a thousand Brahmans and presented them with *dakshinas* of pearls and gems.‡ It is even probable that Hindu missionaries went to Ceylon to convert the islanders to Hinduism. The age of the great South Indian saints might have beheld the vigorous propagation of Hinduism not only in India but in Ceylon as well. The Thiruvathavurpuranam§ refers to a king of Ceylon who visited Chidambaram and was converted to Hinduism. Manikka Vachaka appears to have gone to Ceylon, ‖ and perhaps he was the saint entertained, according to the Raja Ratnacari, by Matevalessen, Raja of Ceylon.¶ We also hear occasionally of Buddhists arriving in Ceylon for some reason or other. Professor Wilson tells us that about 788 A. D. Prince Hemasitala expelled a body of Buddhists from Kanchi to Ceylon ; ** and the Mahavamsa refers to a king of Kalinga who towards the close of the sixth century adopted Buddhism and entered a Ceylonese Vihara along with his wife and minister. †† Such arrivals of Buddhists in Ceylon should have been of frequent occurrence.

While Buddhist pilgrims and Tamil invaders made their presence more and more largely felt in Ceylon, bands of Ceylonese arrived in various parts of South India. Tradition

* Vide *Kosmos Indikopleustes* in McCrindle's *Ancient India*, pp. 100-101.

† Legge's *Travels of Fa Hian*, p. 104.

‡ Wijesinha's *Mahavamsa*, p. 71.

§ *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Part II, p. 63 [1846]

‖ *The Madura Manual*, p. 53.

¶ *Raja Ratnacari* [Upham] p. 81.

** The *Mackenzie Collection*, Vols. I, LXV and LXVI.

†† Wijesinha's *Mahavamsa*, p. 20.

connects the Thiyars* or Ilavars † of the Malabar coast with Ceylon, ‡ and the Shanars of Tinnevelly are also supposed to have come from the same island §. They belonged probably to the lower classes among the Singhalese. Early inscriptions ‖ in Travancore recognise the Thiyars as a distinct community engaged in the cultivation of the cocoanut. Hiuen Tsiang who visited Kanchi in the seventh century of the Christian era, met there large bodies of the Singhalese who had fled from their country. The long series of civil wars which convulsed the island sent streams of Singhalese to seek refuge on the Indian mainland. A Tanjore grant of Raja Raja Chola, in defining the revenue in gold and paddy to be paid to the Raja-Rajesvara temple exempts certain holdings from taxation, and among them we find what are called Ilachcheries.¶ It is highly probable that these Ilachcheries were Singhalese settlements—they were so called from their being villages inhabited by the people of Ilam. Whatever might have been the real cause, whether religious and political persecution or the spirit of adventure, that brought these people to India, their social status appears to have always been low. The early Malabar records recognise the Ilavars as a caste of cocoanut-tree-climbers on a par with artisans and labourers.** And the inscription of Raja Raja exempting these people from taxation, also suggests that their social status was low. Their villages are grouped with those of some of the lowest castes in the Hindu social order.†† And at the present day on the Malabar coast the enterprising Ilava or Thiya is still regarded as of low caste; the modern position of the Shanar whose vocation corresponds to that of the Malabar Thiya is no higher.

---

* தீபர் > தீவர் = islanders.

† ஈழவர், the people of ஈழம்.

‡ Logan's *Malabar*, pp. 78-79, Gundert in the *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, Vol. XIII., The *Travancore Census Report*, 1901.

§ Caldwell's *History of Tinnevelly*, p. 4.

‖ The *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, Vol. XIII.

¶ Beal's *Life of Hiuen Tsiang*, p.139.

** *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. II., Part I, pp. 54-57. ஈழச்சேரி.

†† Dr. Gundert's *Inscriptions*. Cf also சோவர் [another name for the ஈழவர்] derived by Dr. Gundert from சேவகர் = Servants.

"இவ்வூர் ஈழச்சேரியும் பறைச்சேரியும் வெள்ளான் சுடுகாடும் பறைச்சுடுகாடும் கற்கிடையும் ஆக இறையிலி நீக்குநிலம் etc." *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. II., part I., page 54, line 29.

But while the stream that flowed into India was gentle and unruffled in its course, the other and larger stream that flowed into Ceylon was accompanied by all the horrors of violence and destruction. While the one lost its distinct character and became Indianized, the other, though influencing its surroundings, kept itself unmixed. The Ceylonese in India lost their speech and lost all marks of a distinct nationality; while the Tamils in Ceylon continue to this day a distinct people separated from the Singhalese by religion, language and social institutions.

U. P. KUKILLAYA.

NOTES OF THE MONTH.

IN its issue of the 28th ult., *The Examiner* pays us the compliment of quoting in full our recent remarks about the Papal Syllabus and commenting on them in some detail. The importance of the subject, and the considerable amount of agreement between *The Examiner's* view and our own, seem to make it worth while to set forth as clearly as possible the exact point of divergence. The real issue is whether or not the Christian revelation is to be regarded as having consisted in a "determinate body of doctrine." We hold that it was and is a revelation *of God*; by the Roman Church, and—inconsistently, as we think—by a great deal of Protestant opinion, it is regarded as a revelation *of truths about God*. Our Bombay contemporary appears to consider this a distinction without a difference. We hold, on the contrary, that it is an absolutely vital difference, and there can be no better way of making the point clear than by quoting from and answering *The Examiner's* very lucid argument.

REFERRING to our own description of Christianity as a religious movement having as the spring of its life and growth a new relationship of the soul to God, established and rendered possible by Christ, our contemporary says:—"This we fully admit and maintain. But if this is the case, we have at once 'a body of doctrines.' The fact of that 'new relationship' is doctrine No. 1. The fact that 'it was made possible by Christ' is doctrine No. 2. What is that new relation? It must be something definite, and the answer will be doctrine No. 3. How was it made possible by Christ? The answer gives doctrine No. 4. How are we to enter into that relation? The answer, if definite, gives doctrine No. 5. Can that relation be lost? The answer gives doctrine No. 6. If lost, can it be recovered? The answer gives doctrine No. 7.

Once possessed, can it be intensified and developed, and how? The answer gives doctrine No. 8."

In reply to this argument, we would ask the simple question, 'what would be the nature of these supposed eight doctrines?' They would constitute a statement of *our understanding* of the religious movement called Christianity. Now we would never for a moment deny that if we allow ourselves to entertain a definite conception of Christianity, we are thereby involving ourselves in doctrines. But then they are *our* doctrines, and share nothing of the sacrosanctity of that Christianity of which we have dared to form a conception. A religious movement may have a superhuman cause and origin, and yet our understanding of it may be very human and defective. A religious movement may have a determinate character whereby it remains the same spiritual reality throughout the centuries and yet the doctrines in which we set forth our conception of its nature and its conditions may change very radically as time goes on. In fact, it is to be expected that they should, for a growing thing—and a living religion is a growing thing—reveals its nature only gradually. The meaning of the acorn is revealed only in the oak. Nor is it only growing things that are in this position. The solar system has remained the same physical system for ages, and yet our astronomical doctrines have passed through a Copernican revolution.

Upon one assumption the cogency of this our answer would disappear. That assumption, however, is ruled out by the description of Christianity which *The Examiner* professes to accept from us, but of which it fails to recognise the significance. Continuing the argument quoted above, the writer says:—" However adaptable in form and mode of expression these eight doctrines may be, all adaptations must be in substance continuous with their idea, or else the movement will change its character, and will no longer be the one inaugurated by Christ but an offshoot and departure from it. Hence there must be some essential identity running through all adaptations; and unless the character of the original movement can be fixed in terms of 'a body of doctrine,' there will be nothing enabling us to say whether we are still partakers of that movement or not." Now, this contention of the writer will be self-evidently true only if it is assumed not merely—as he has proved—that we entertain doctrines about Christianity but that Christianity is founded upon those doctrines. This, however, is exactly what we have denied from the first. We described Christianity as having its spring not in doctrines about a new relationship to God, but in that new relationship itself. And Christ's work we regarded as consisting

not in the communication of these doctrines but in establishing and rendering possible that new relationship. If we wish to satisfy ourselves that our Christianity is the same spiritual reality as that of the first century, examination of the doctrines is no safe guide. For the doctrines might be the same and the spiritual life different, or the spiritual life the same and the doctrines different. What we have to investigate is whether we are enjoying the same kind of conscious relationship to God as the Christians of that age, and of this the test is whether or not we feel ourselves at home in the atmosphere of the piety of the New Testament, even though we may not be able to accept all the New Testament doctrines.

To all this we doubt not that our critic's instinctive answer will be that a revelation *of* God means revealed *ideas about* God, and that Christ could not establish and render possible a new relationship to God save by imparting ideas about Him and about this relationship. "Christianity," he writes, "was of course 'a religious movement,' but a movement inspired and guided by certain ideas. These ideas were communicated to the Church, partly by the direct teaching of Christ himself, partly by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost guiding the apostles—so that the body of doctrines inherited from the apostles was authentically God's revelation, and remains such to this day. Secondly, we do not deny the adaptability of that revelation to different times and places; but what we maintain is that this adaptation must never be such as to adapt the original body of doctrines out of existence." In reply we admit without hesitation that ideas about God are a necessary instrument of any revelation of God. But the ideas are not the revelation, and the revelation may be real although the ideas are in error. A revelation of God is an unveiling of His presence as a self-evidencing Reality of life. It can take place only in the individual consciousness, although the experience may repeat itself in very similar fashion for one after another of a multitude of individuals. God cannot make Himself real in this way to an individual without the agency of ideas about Himself, and to that individual those ideas are, for the time being at least, essential to the revelation. In fact, since these ideas express the meaning which this experience of God has *for his thought*, he may in a sense call these ideas the revelation. But, in strictness, these ideas reveal God to him only because, taken in conjunction with the rest of his moral and intellectual ideas, they seem to solve the most pressing enigmas of existence and make his experience of life instinct with glorious meaning, pointing to a Divine Being as its source. Taken in conjunction, then, with the rest of his thought, these ideas may be

called a revelation. So taken, they lead him into the very truth of things, namely, the fact that he is really face to face with God. But if the rest of his thought changes, these ideas may cease to illumine life with Divine meaning; they may cease to reveal God. They are not really the revelation but only its temporary vehicle. An analogy may help to illustrate our meaning. The moon is at its fullest orb, but heavy clouds obscure almost the whole face of the heavens. The observer may believe that the moon is above, but in the whole plain there is only one spot from which he can look up through the clouds and perceive the moon's reality with all the assurance of his senses. He makes his way to that point of view and gets the glorious vision. But the clouds drift again, and he must change his point of view if the vision is to be restored. That is a rough symbol of the spiritual history of humanity, and sometimes even of an individual. The mind of man is travelling through the plain of experience, peering up into the cloudy enigmas of the age which historical forces are driving across the mental sky. By the Spirit of God it is led to the single intellectual standpoint from which the enigmas of the age assume a configuration that allows the Divine radiance to shine through, flooding the soul with its convincing, satisfying light. But the forces of historical progress drive the clouds onwards again. The enigmas of life change their configuration, and if the human mind is not to lose the radiant vision of the Divine, it must journey on to a new intellectual standpoint. The human mind receives its revelation of God by the aid of a body of doctrines, but if the revelation is to remain the same, the doctrines must alter with the age.

CHRIST drew men on to an intellectual and moral standpoint from which God as Father became an over-powering reality to them, creating in them the filial attitude. He did so partly by His teaching, still more by His life and by the magic of His personality. As a matter of fact the ideas which He made use of in His teaching, and by means of which He drew men on to that standpoint and attitude which made God for them a soul-satisfying, soul-rebuking Reality, were so little the abstractions of a temporary philosophy and so largely the permanent ideas of common practical life, that the revelation of God as the modern Christian experiences it may still be formulated in the language of the parables of Jesus. But in the case of Jesus' followers it has not been equally so. To a greater extent they have formulated the standpoint which made real to their experience the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ in language which derived its meaning from the abstract reflection of their time. So we have a Pauline theology, a Petrine, a

Johannine theology, a theology of Augustine, of Anselm, of Calvin. It is foolish to exaggerate the differences between them. Their agreement is far more important than their divergence. But it is equally wrong to ignore the fact of difference. The permanent identity of Christianity does not lie in its body of doctrine but in its faith,—in the Christian attitude of soul which has ever to conserve its assurance of God by transforming not its language only, but its doctrinal ideas, in relation to the new problems of the age. Had it been otherwise,—had the identity of the Christian faith depended upon the conformity of Christian thought with an original body of doctrine, theological experts would have been the very persons to pronounce with practical finality upon the legitimacy of new teaching, and the issue of the Papal Syllabus would have been a wise proceeding. But the identity of the Christian faith is an identity of spirit and not of idea, and experts steeped in ecclesiastical lore are peculiarly liable to fail to recognise the old spirit in the new thought.

One final remark may be permitted. We may be asked what justification we have for giving so unusual a definition of 'revelation,'—one, moreover, which destroys the possibility of any authoritative definition of doctrine. We answer, in the first place, that the disappearance of all idea of authoritative doctrinal definitions would be a gain, not a loss. The true Christian attitude is not a belief in an attained finality of knowledge, but a following on to know the Lord. Our seeing "through a glass darkly" does not mean only that our knowledge of God is fragmentary, yet perfectly accurate so far as it goes. It means that, whether seemingly fragmentary or seemingly a rounded theory, it is imperfect through and through. In the second place, we answer that our definition of 'revelation' results from nothing else than a faithful carrying out of two principles,—the Protestant principle of the right and duty of private judgment, and the idea that revelation must be something authoritative. The only intellectual authority, the recognition of which is consistent with the duty of private judgment, is the authority of the self-evident. We dare surrender criticism only when we cannot help the surrender, because soul and mind are satisfied. But ultimately nothing is satisfying, nothing self-evidencing, save God Himself—that is, His recognised Presence. When He makes Himself a self-evident reality to us by the aid of certain ideas, those ideas acquire a borrowed sanctity, which for the time being makes it psychologically impossible for us really to doubt them. But the sanctity lasts only so long as through these ideas God makes Himself self-evident. He gives us light for one intellectual step at a time, and then calls us to rise on the stepping-stones of our dead ideas to higher things.

"I THINK," says the writer of the striking article on 'The Tragic Fact in Lear' with which our present issue opens, "if we were to consider mankind as one vast society of persons, the actual measure of pain inflicted on mankind might be found to correspond with some rough degree of justness to the actions of mankind. Shakespeare does not indeed suggest such a correspondence: but he does at least show that human action is the vastly preponderating element in the cause of all human pain." Mr. Davies appears to find this correspondence of aggregate suffering with aggregate responsibity not easily reconcilable with ethical ideas. "From our human standpoint," he says, "we cannot hold the gods to be either just or benevolent." And yet he allows that the outcome and meaning of the tragic fact in life is that evil in its very nature "is shown to be negative, barren, self-destructive," and surely that is at least part of the essence of cosmic justice. And when he further confesses that one would rather suffer with Lear and Cordelia than be a colourless Albany, we feel that it is not quite fair to "the gods" to deny in them any benevolence towards even those two hardly treated sufferers. Mr. Davies, in fact, really takes us deeper into the heart of things than he professes. The standpoint from which "we cannot hold the gods to be either just or benevolent" is not really his own, nor need it be the typically human standpoint.

IN these reflections there is contained, in substance, our answer to the correspondent who writes to us this month in criticism of what we have ventured to call the Christian conception of *karma*. The idea of humanity being collectively involved in the penalties of a guilt for which individuals are responsible appears to him a moral enormity irreconcilable with the goodness of God. And yet he is not insensible to the glory of such vicarious suffering. Surely there is something strangely inconsistent in admitting that it is "glorious" for a man to endure, for the sake of the common good, sufferings which he has not individually deserved, and at the same time affirming that God is degraded by our supposing Him to assign to men this "glorious" lot. We have always had an uncomfortable sense—if we may confess our own feeling quite frankly—that there is something petty, and unworthy of the real greatness of Indian thought, in the Hindu doctrine of *karma* when it is offered *as a solution of the problem of the inequality of suffering*. We have hoped that this aspect of that doctrine might be supposed to have originated in ancient crude popular reflection, and to have been accepted without sufficient examination by the higher thought of India, partly because its general popularity obscured its need of criticism. The conception of *karma* has another aspect, however, which we count supremely valuable, namely, its assertion of an ethical continuity between moral

evil and suffering--of an origin of suffering in sin. And when we appealed to Indians to purge out the individualism of their conception of *karma* and by consequence to surrender their very mechanical solution of the problem of the inequality of human suffering, we conceived ourselves to be only asking them to abandon the superficial and unworthy, and to conserve the deep and true, in their ancient doctrine.

WE will try to set forth as clearly as may be possible in the limited space at our disposal our reasons (1) for feeling that there is something petty in the popular Hindu doctrine, (2) for denying that it is a belief necessarily involved in our faith in the justice of God. The popular doctrine really seems to involve the idea that pleasure is the supreme end of man, pain his greatest curse. Or at least we may say that, if this *were* the fact, then the doctrine would be morally necessary. If pleasure and pain were the great concerns of life, then it would certainly seem that a benevolent Deity ought to dispense them equally, and that if He did not do so, it must be supposed that men had merited them unequally, either in the present or some previous existence. But if Hinduism commits itself to this assumption of the supreme importance of pleasure and pain, it is really being unworthy of itself. For no religion has shown itself capable of a more heroic development of asceticism and self-mortification than Hinduism, and these practices imply the conviction that pleasure is comparatively a trivial thing and that pain is to be welcomed for spiritual ends. Now, if the Hindu ascetic may count pain a good when incurred in the cause of his own spiritual advancement, surely others may be permitted to reckon it a privilege and a blessing that they are compelled to suffer undeservedly when this suffering is required for the spiritual good of humanity. It seems to us that when, without prejudice, we compare the popular Hindu idea that each man is shut in with his own destiny and can enjoy and suffer nothing but what he has himself deserved, and the Christian idea that men are required to share in exhausting the penalties which humanity at large has brought upon itself by its sin, in order that they may thus help to prevent the ruin which sin tends to bring upon the race,—required, moreover, to do this without stopping to calculate the precise fraction of the general penalty which they themselves individually deserve, every one of proper feeling must confess that the Christian idea is worthier both of God and of man than the individualistic Hindu conception. The Christian reply to the problem of the unequal distribution of pleasure and suffering is to educate men into a view of sin and suffering and salvation which causes the problem to disappear by making unmerited suffering as welcome as pleasure.

In the second place, we think it is a defective analysis of justice which leads to the idea that God is morally bound to reward men according to their individual deserts. The defect of the Hindu doctrine of *karma*, considered as a theory of punishment, is that while it rightly asserts that suffering is essentially connected with wrong-doing, it does not ask why. The real connection is not mechanical but teleological. If suffering did not follow upon sin, we could not believe in the morality of God. Why not? Because, if God is a moral Being, seeking good ends, He must have fashioned all the properties of the universe so that they should be fit instruments for good ends. And if they are fit instruments for good ends, they must be unfit instruments for bad ends, and the system of the universe must work clumsily and bring forth suffering and disappointment in all sorts of unexpected directions, if any one tries to use its powers for evil purposes. There is nothing in the constitution of a moral universe to necessitate that the suffering which sin directly occasions shall fall on the sinner alone. The proof of the moral nature of the universe is just what Mr. Davies has described as the lesson of Shakespeare's 'King Lear', namely, that evil shall show itself to be "negative, barren, self-destructive," and shall be followed by wide-spread tragedy. If God does to some degree by His providence adjust individual suffering in particular cases to individual deserts, this is not a demand of justice, but an educative expedient. But the Christian view is that God's educative method is not so simple as this. Instead, He has bound men together in a great community of destiny, and in the person of His Son He has entered that community and set the supreme example of the acceptance of unmerited penalty. Thereby He has inaugurated a spirit of social devotion which, accepting humanity's *karma*, triumphs over it and wins out of the tragedy wrought by evil the beginning of a glorious future. In regard to this whole question we have always to remember that rewards and punishments are not the essence of justice, but only instruments which are sometimes useful in the service of the good.

LITERARY NOTICES AND NOTES.

Nelson's Indian Readers. First Book: Price, *As.* 8. Second Book: Price, *As.* 10. Third Book: Price, *As.* 12.: Messrs. T. Nelson & Sons, London, etc.: 1907.

This is an excellent series of reading books. They have in them everything to lay hold of the attention and interest of the pupil—happily chosen lessons, information attractively presented, and beautiful illustrations. Opinion will always differ as to the poetical extracts

which pupils in the Lower Secondary classes should read, and the present series has at least two pieces of poetry which we have found Sixth Form boys make but little of. Books that have not a few stories with reference to gods and goddesses would be none the worse of one with reference to God, nor would the series suffer by the excision of the Lesson that is entitled 'The Clever Cooly.' Surely *clever* is used here in a very misleading sense. But when we have said this, we have nothing but praise for the manner in which in these books reading, composition, conversation, and grammar are co-ordinated. Much, doubtless, depends on teaching, but here are most valuable materials for teacher and pupil. The boy that goes through these readers with care and attention will have his intelligence quickened, his knowledge increased, and a grip of English as a living language which will stand him in good stead in the upper classes as well as in his own further reading.

Arithmetic for Schools. By the Rev. J. B. Lock, M.A., Fellow and Bursar of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co.: 1907.

We have much pleasure in recommending this book as a text-book for High School Classes. One noticeable feature of the book is its up-to-dateness. Principles are fully explained and technical terms are clearly defined. We agree with the author in holding that the Unitary Method of solving problems is not to be wholly condemned. We are of opinion that the Unitary Method is far more serviceable in the lower forms than the Dot Method (Rule of Three), in which the pupil is very likely to ignore the reasoning process running through the whole work. If we are asked to mention the chapter of the book which pupils will most appreciate, it is that on Stocks. Almost all the difficult points usually raised in the class room by those who learn the subject for the first time are anticipated and clearly explained. The chief difficulty of a problem in Arithmetic is that of making out the meaning of the words in which the question is clothed. In this book, exercises under each chapter and miscellaneous examples are so worded that no pupil of average ability is likely to feel any difficulty whatever in understanding them. The value of the book would be considerably enhanced if a few harder problems were added to the miscellaneous examples given at the end. The author says that Arithmetic should be studied not only as the means of rapid and accurate calculation but also as a preliminary part of Mathematics, calling for accurate thought and ingenuity. We are in entire agreement with this view of the study of Arithmetic.

Literary Notes.

A new and uniform edition of the works of the late Dr. Robertson Smith is to be published by Messrs. A. and C. Black in four volumes. These volumes will include "The Old Testament and the Jewish Church," "The Religion of the Semites," "The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History," and "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia."

Mr. Evan Charteris has published, with notes, and in the original spelling, "A short account of the affairs of Scotland, in 1744—6, written in exile by his kinsman, David, Lord Elcho, who commanded the Guards of Prince Charles. This document has never before been published, but it has been used on more than one occasion, and in particular, by Sir Walter Scott in 'Tales of a Grandfather.' Though it has thus been robbed of much of its interest, it is well that a manuscript of such importance should be accessible in its original form to the public.

The extraordinary assiduity of the German in matters critical is again illustrated in the coming work of a young scholar, Dr. Otto Zippel, on Thomson's 'Seasons.' Dr. Zippel has completed a collation of all the original texts with the various readings of the later editions. Mr. Edmund Gosse, writing of the work, says "I have had the privilege of inspecting the scheme of Dr. Zippel's work, which is of marvellous intricacy. More than ever could I appreciate the reluctance which native scholars have shown in grappling with a work so involved and so fatiguing." In the case of 'Summer' and 'Winter' so numerous were the variants presented to him that he has had to produce in full two texts, and he may be compelled to add a third.

The *Academy* referring to "our Monthly Magazines" says that the majority of them are "degenerate productions." "Stupidly written and coarsely illustrated, they are very frequently badly printed. Judged as a whole, they are poorer in every respect than the productions of a dozen or fifteen years ago." And what about such Weeklies as the *Academy* itself? Of late it has taken to making violent and undignified attacks upon all its contemporaries, the daily newspapers included. We expect a journal that pursues a policy of carping and disparaging criticism towards the whole world of journalism to be itself above reproach: but the following are specimens of the skill with which the *Academy* is edited. In a paragraph by the Editor we find this amazing statement: "so, if we want to steal, we just pass an act repealing the Sixth Commandment." It is not surprising that an Editor who does not know which is the Sixth Commandment, should accuse the Bishop

of London of not understanding "in the *smallest* degree the real object of the religion which he so fervently champions." Again, in a review of Rhodes' *History of the United States* the same Editor allows this to appear in his columns. "All these, together with the main contentions of the rival champions, Daniel Webster and J. C. Calhoun, and the extreme garrison (*sic*) abolitionist propaganda, are touched upon." And William Lloyd Garrison was himself an Editor and a printer!

Mr. Arthur Kitson's *Captain James Cook, R.N., F.R.S., "the Circumnavigator"* (John Murray) supersedes all previous biographies of the great sailor and discoverer. The *Athenæum* says that we have now for the first time "a complete, accurate and unsensational account" of all the voyages, and that too in one volume.

The death is announced of Mr. George Allen, the publisher of Ruskin's Works. Ruskin discovered Allen in the fifties at the Working Men's College and encouraged him as an engraver in steel. It is the beauty of the plates in the first Edition of Ruskin's Works, combined with the Author's reluctance to consent to any subsequent edition, that makes those early publications so much sought after. Allen as Ruskin's publisher paid him £50,000 in royalties. The cheap editions of recent years, brought out in view of the expiry of the copyright, must have already given a handsome profit.

SCIENCE NOTES.

A new method of colour photography has been invented by Messrs. Lumière, of Paris. It depends upon the principle employed in all three-colour processes, *viz.*, that if red, green and violet are suitably blended, the effect of any other colour may be obtained. The plate on which the photograph is taken is coated with starch granules which have been selected of fairly uniform size and dyed red, green, and violet, respectively. They are mixed in such proportions that no colour predominates and spread upon the plate as a film one layer thick. The interstices between the granules are filled up by pressing and more or less crushing the grains so as to form a mosaic which appears to the unaided eye of a neutral grey. This layer is now varnished and a specially sensitised emulsion is spread over it. The exposure is made with a suitable colour screen at the lens so that the red; greeu, and violet may act upon the plate in their proper proportions, as the emulsionis not str ictly orthochromatic. The plate is put in the dark slide so that the glass side may be next the lens, in order that the

light may be filtered through the layer of coloured granules before it reaches the emulsion. The plate is developed in the ordinary way and is then changed into a positive by dissolving out the metallic silver by an acid oxidising solution and reducing the remaining silver bromide to the metallic state by means of a developer. The result is a three-coloured grained transparency.

At the annual exhibition of the Royal Photographic Society held last month in London, Messrs. Lumière exhibited some colour photographs taken by the method described above. As these photographs consist of transparencies on glass, they were arranged in a darkened portion of a balcony where they were shown to advantage. They were awarded a medal by the judges, some of the pictures being excellent, through others were unsatisfactory owing to the predominance of one of the three colours. Another conspicuous feature of the exhibition was the display of photographs of living creatures, among them being Mr. Douglas English's photographs, illustrating the life and history of the British mud-wasp, Mrs. Veley's "Lemur Studies," and Mr. W. Bickerton's photographs of the common tern alighting at its nest after flight. Such photographs are by no means easy to get and the taking of them appears a better form of amusement than the "sport" which some people find in the shooting of harmless creatures.

In 1903, Sir William Ramsay found that helium was formed as the result of the spontaneous change of radium emanation. He now finds that if the emanation is in contact with and dissolved in water, neon is produced instead of helium. Further, if a saturated solution of copper sulphate is substituted for water, argon is produced, with only a trace of neon. The importance of this discovery consists in this being the first successful attempt to change in some way the products of disintegration. Sir William Ramsay considers that from its inactivity it is probable that radium emanation belongs to the helium series of elements. During its spontaneous change, it parts with a relatively enormous amount of energy. The direction in which that energy is expended may be modified by circumstances. If the emanation is alone, or in contact with hydrogen and oxygen gases, a portion is decomposed or disintegrated by the energy given off by the rest. The gaseous substance produced is in this case helium. If, however, the distribution of the energy is modified by the presence of water, that portion of the emanation which is decomposed yields neon; if in presence of copper sulphate, argon.

A DISCUSSION on the value of alcohol took place in the Physiology section of the British Association this year. The discussion was opened by Prof. Cushny who reviewed the effect of alcohol on the various systems of the body, alluding especially to its very doubtful effect as a stimulant to the alimentary system. In the subsequent discussion it is reported in *Nature* that on one point there was unanimity, namely, that alcohol even in the smallest quantities was deleterious to the quality of mental work. This was insisted on, not only by Sir Victor Horsley, but by Prof. Dixon, who took a much more optimistic view of the value of alcohol. Prof. Dixon especially considered it valuable in cases of cardiac collapse, on account of the readiness with which it appears to be absorbed and assimilated. Diagrams were exhibited by Sir Victor Horsley to show the gradual diminution in the use of alcohol in the treatment of disease. These were based on the statistics of the large London hospitals and showed that the amount spent on alcohol had fallen in these hospitals from about £8,000 to about £3,000 per annum. In hospitals for the treatment of fevers—for which alcohol was formerly supposed to be especially beneficial—the annual expenditure on alcohol has fallen from £1,388 in 1894 to £515 in 1905, although the number of patients has increased from 20,000 to 27,000.

REGARDING the effect of alcohol in lessening the power of the body to resist toxic agents, Dr. Reid Hunt has carried out a series of experiments which points conclusively to the fact that alcohol lowers the power of resistance of the body to a certain specific toxic body, acetonitryl. A good deal was said by various speakers on the question as to whether alcohol was a food. The impression left on the mind at the end of the discussion, according to *Nature*, was that, whether alcohol is or is not a food is largely a matter of definition. It seems certain, on the one hand, that it is oxidised in the body, yielding a corresponding amount of energy—in this sense it is a food. Such a definition includes many substances—morphia, for instance—which are clearly injurious. If alcohol is not only a "food," but "a useful food" it must be shown that it can be taken without injury to the organism in sufficient quantities to supply an appreciable proportion of the energy of the body. This has not yet been done.

AT another meeting of the British Association the theory of ionisation was discussed. Sir Oliver Lodge emphasised the distinction between the terms "electrolyse" and "ionise." Electrolyse signifies decomposition, ionise means making ready for decomposition, or decomposing and leaving the products of decomposition in the fluid

instead of getting rid of them at the electrodes. To ionise really means to convert a substance into an electrolytic conductor, and for that process the term is wanted. As to the nature of ionisation, the facts to be expressed are that the atoms are perfectly free to travel, and that an extremely minute force will set them in motion. Prof. Abegg pointed out that the theory of ionisation was needed to account for the duplication of the number of molecules which is indicated by any method of counting, such as lowering of the freezing point and osmotic pressure. The difficulty felt by some chemists in realising how simple solution should effect such a thorough change of molecular state is lessened if it is recognised that even in the solid state the molecules are often dissociated. Internal friction is the cause of the small conductivity of solids, not want of dissociation.

About fifteen years ago Mr. Shelford Bidwell devised apparatus for the electrical transmission of pictures to a distance, in which use was made of sensitive selenium cells. There was a transmitting cylinder which revolved at a uniform rate on a spindle and a selenium cell was placed in the cylinder in electrical communication with the spindle. The picture was projected on the cylinder by means of a lens and received through a pinhole on the cell. There was a similar receiving cylinder with a style in contact with paper which was moistened with potassium iodine. When a current passed, iodine was liberated and the picture traced with it on the paper. Mr. Bidwell was able to transmit simple black and white pictures, but could not reproduce half-tones. This difficulty has now been overcome by Prof. A. Korn of Munich, the sluggishness which selenium exhibits in responding to changes of illumination being eliminated by means of a second selenium cell in the receiving apparatus, so that any fall in the resistance of the cell in the transmitting apparatus is balanced by an equal fall in the other. For receiving the picture Prof. Korn uses a sensitised photographic film upon a point of which light is concentrated from a lamp. The apparatus has been worked successfully over long distances, *e.g.*, from Munich to Berlin.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Reincarnation and Karma.

Dear Sir,

I read with sincere pleasure your remarks anent the doctrine o *Karma* and the possibility of absorbing, or rather reading, into the Christian faith a modified form of it. Will you kindly allow me, Sir, to offer a few remarks of my own?

To begin with, let me acknowledge your desire to appreciate all that is good in a religion not your own. If, as you say, Christianity has awakened India and made a 'Thillai Govindan' possible, India has, by that very awakening, not failed to react on thoughtful and cultured Christian minds.

Coming to your remarks on the doctrine of *Karma* I have to make two observations. Firstly, you seem to think that while there is, in the Christian faith, room and even need for another life or lives in addition to the present earthly one, that other life cannot be (according to you) on the earthly plane again. You hint at the existence of some other conscious realm or realms intermediate between life on this earth and the final consummation. You do not state clearly what objection there is to accept the Hindu doctrine of another life on the earth as known to us; and the necessity for postulating an unknown intermediary realm is not, to my mind, by any means obvious. The so-called "memory" difficulty in the way of the reception of this Hindu idea is purely *psychological*, and ought not to weigh in the consideration of the problem, which is purely *metaphysical*.

This, however, is comparatively a mere detail, and is of little consequence so long as the vital doctrine of the ethical insufficiency of *one* life is frankly admitted.

The next observation which I have got to make refers to the modification in the theory of *Karma*, which you say is necessary before it can be woven into the fabric of Christian belief. In this modification of yours it seems to me you have well-nigh withdrawn with the one hand what you so generously granted with the other. Frankly, I really cannot understand your theory of a *Karma* of the "Universe as a collective whole." I cannot see the *ethical justice* of one man being made to suffer for the sins of another. I shall grant that it is very glorious for the sufferer, and that possibly he acquires considerable spiritual merit by the self-sacrifice, but what shall we think of the Responsible Creator who not merely tolerates but systematises and perpetuates an arrangement so radically opposed to our deepest sense of right and wrong, responsibility and punishment? Your theory certainly elevates man but, I am afraid, in the same proportion it detracts from the worth of God.

It is just this difficulty that the doctrine of *Karma* professes to solve,—whatever be the merit of that solution. But your modification of it renders that solution impossible and takes away all that is worth having in the theory. The difficulty which the *Karma* doctrine is intended to remove, is, in your modification of it, accentuated and even glorified. On page 92 of the August number of the magazine you describe the Christian conception of the doctrine of *Karma*

to be "the conception of the race as collectively privileged to consume the *Karma* of all its individual members, the consumption *not necessarily* being allocated according to individual merit and responsibility."

With due respect to you, Sir, I beg to state that this exposition of the theory is the direct opposite of what is generally accepted as the true doctrine of *Karma*, and no true Hindu can accept it without at the same time surrendering all that is essential in the theory as propounded by Hindus, whether ancient or modern.

"S"

[*Note.*—In our 'Notes of the Month' will be found the answer which we make to our correspondent's esteemed letter so far as *Karma* is concerned. As regards reincarnation we will say only this. The reasons which attract us to a doctrine of reincarnation are set forth in the article on 'Christianity in the Modern World' in our September issue. There the present life known to us is treated as but one phase in a grand evolution which has for its universal goal a perfected community. Our duty in the present life is to work for the reconstruction of society. Our death, it is suggested, is a crisis of change whereby we pass into a new phase of existence, the 'fruit' of our present life, and labour again at the same great task, assisted by the education which our former life has given us and which is conserved to us by memory. Now, why must our present life—the life we know—be the *first* life? Why should it not be a second, or some other, life? Because we do not remember any previous life. But why should there be memory? Because otherwise there is no psychological reason why later lives should be any improvement on the first. We should have to begin afresh, with no lessons learned. Moreover there would be no grand community of interest between those who have, and those who have not, passed through earthly death, making them all one great 'Kingdom of God'. Our correspondent complains that to lay stress on "the memory difficulty" is to mix up metaphysics and psychology, but for our part we are not interested in any metaphysics that is indifferent to psychological considerations.—Ed.]

RECENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

THE *Contemporary Review* for September opens with an article on 'The Development of an International Parliament' by Professor H. Stanley Jevons. There is an analogy, says Professor Jevons, between the evolution of ordered government among individuals and the development of law and justice between nations, which, while it must not be pushed to extremes, is yet sufficiently close to be of service in the study of the international problem. Nations, being aggregates of individuals, are swayed by the same passions and motives and amenable to the same restraints as individuals. The relations between nations are, strictly speaking, the relations between the governments which for the time being manage the affairs of the nations, and the moral code of a government is a kind of average of the moral codes of the majority which places it in power. Governments, then, being but magnified human beings, we may expect that ordered arrangements will grow up between them as they have grown up amongst individuals. Prof. Jevons proceeds, therefore, to explain briefly the evolution of government among mankind, and in particular directs attention to the disappearance of private arming. History shows that individuals give up carrying weapons only when there is a well-

ordered and secure government, and not then until experience has more than adequately demonstrated the security. It may be argued, Professor Jevons says, that a similar condition is necessary for the disappearance of national armaments.

Turning to the development of international relations Professor Jevons says they are already passing through the early stage of political growth in which certain kinds of disputes are referred by common consent to a third party for settlement. Since 1794 more than 500 international cases have been referred to arbitration. The outstanding features of the present situation are firstly, the real though not always apparent distrust which every nation feels of certain others, secondly, the enormous and ruinous growth of armaments, and thirdly, the foundation by the first Hague Conference of a permanent judicial machinery. Such being the conditions, what is the next step forward which the friends of peace would be well advised to urge? Not, says Prof. Jevons, an immediate agreement for the reduction of armaments, attractive though this proposal is. If guidance in the matter can be obtained from the analogy of the disappearance of private arming among individuals, the only practical way to disarmament among the nations is the development of international confidence, which, once established, will render arms superfluous. But, it may be asked, what guarantee is there that in this way success will ultimately be achieved? The fact, says Professor Jevons, that this way lies in the natural course of evolution. Whenever, he says, men have tried to mould the future growth of peoples in opposition to the natural course of evolution they have failed, or produced but, transitory effects, but whenever they have pushed the car of progress a little faster along the line which it was in any case following, they have been abundantly successful.

Assuming that education, international trade, and foreign travel continue to develop with the progress of material civilisation, it would seem impossible, says Professor Jevons, that a world-wide governing power should not ultimately arise. In the hope of contributing something towards the formation of an ideal which may concentrate men's efforts towards peace, he ventures to outline his conception of a workable government of nations, and to show how in his opinion such a government may be realised. He believes that, provided judicious efforts are made by the friends of peace to hasten the natural rate of evolution, the kind of world-wide federal government which he depicts might well arise in seventy or eighty years from the present time; and he asks his readers to project themselves thus far into the future and follow with him the working of the International Government, established in its own Parliamentary Buildings and Government Offices at The Hague, and consisting of three branches, the legislative body or Senate, the Executive Government, and the Judiciary. Having described the principal features of the International Government, he considers in imagination the effects of its working in certain international situations which have arisen in recent years. He proceeds finally to indicate the gradual changes by which such a government might in time be realised in actual fact. It is obvious, he says, that The Hague Conference is the institution which will be shaped step by step into a world-wide federal Government. There is no question for practical men of destroying and recreating. What has been established will persist, but ever growing, ever increasing in efficiency. There must be no attempt, however, at the sudden establishment of any complete scheme preconceived in its entirety. Human nature, though not averse to a succession of small changes tending ever in one direction, permits only small changes, and it is only by slow degrees that wholly new institutions may be built up. "It is a long road which leads to permanent peace and disarmament, and many years will be required even to stop the growth of armaments; but there is no shorter way."

Sir William Ramsay contributes a very suggestive article on 'St. Paul's Philosophy of History.' Extraordinarily opposite opinions, says Professor Ramsay, are held by modern scholars about the writings of Paul. The great

majority of scholars, he says, are sentient only of the Judaic element in him. They feel that every paragraph and every idea in his writings are such as only a Jew could have conceived and composed. So far, says Professor Ramsay, "they are perfectly right. Where they err is in thinking that they have understood Paul completely when they have been aware of the Hebrew in him." For Paul was a Hebrew and more besides. Those who only feel the Hebrew in him have not familiarised themselves with the Græco-Roman world in which he lived; they have seldom any sympathy with or understanding of the Hellenism that overran the world of Western Asia, adapted itself to Asia, and changed its character in the adaptation. "Nor do they convey the impression that they have thought much about the subtle tinge or flavour that Rome had imparted to the Græco-Roman civilisation," Were they familiar with the society in which Paul grew up, in which he spent most of his life, and for which he in his mature years felt that he was specially suited, and were they to approach him from that side, they would feel everywhere in his work the spirit of the Tarsian Hellene.

Sir William Ramsay glances first at the fundamental principles of the Philosophy of History, as Paul declares it. These he formulates as follows:—

1. The Divine alone is real: all else is error.
2. A society or a nation is progressive in so far as it hears the Divine voice: all else is degeneration.
3. All men and every human society can hear the Divine voice; but they must co-operate ere the communication can take place.

According to the Pauline view there is nothing real except God; the perception of Divine truth is open to all men; and there was in the pagan world a certain amount of progressive force, a certain perception of Divine truth. Paul, as Professor Ramsay believes, consciously arrived at bringing together on the higher plane of Christian thought and life all that was true and real in the pagan world. While Paul nowhere clearly states his attitude to the pagan world apart from its religious and moral aspects, which were to him abhorrent and detestable, he acknowledges that he had learned from it, that he was bound to pay his debt, and that his young Churches should regulate with wisdom their conduct to the pagan world around and buy to the full all that was profitable for them from the opportunity that the world afforded.

Regarding the Pauline view as a scientific or philosophic theory of the progress of history, Professor Ramsay proceeds to contrast it with what he calls the modern view of development in religion. According to the latter view, he says, there has been a continuous development in religion, in thought and in civilisation, since primitive times. While such a development has been practically universal among the more civilised races, certain less civilised races have remained stationary, or progress among them has been abnormally slow; and while the primitive in religion is barbarous, savage, blood-thirsty, and low in the scale of civilisation, the line of growth normally and usually is towards the milder, the more gracious, and the nobler forms of religion. Further, according to the modern view, the primitive type of religion can be recovered by studying the savage of the present day, and the lowest savage is the most primitive.

Is this, asks Professor Ramsay, the true theory of religious development? Is the modern savage really primitive? Paul, he says, would have maintained that the modern savage represents the last stage of degeneration, that he is the end and not the beginning, that he has lost everything that is really primitive, and that he has fallen so completely from the ancient harmony with the order of nature and sympathy with the Divine as to be on the verge of death and an outrage on the world and on human nature. Who is right, Prof. Ramsay asks, Paul or the moderns? His own experience, he says, shows nothing to confirm the modern assumptions in religious history and a great deal to confirm Paul's view. "With the rarest exceptions, the history of religion among men is a history of degeneration; and the development of

a few Western nations in inventions and in civilisation during recent centuries should not blind us to the fact that among the vast majority of the nations the history of manners and of civilisation is a story of degeneration." In support of what he calls the Pauline view of the progress of history Professor Ramsay appeals to the history of the Mediterranean world, which was for thousands of years the centre of human civilisation and knowledge. Space forbids our entering further into details; and we must refer our readers to the article itself. We ought, perhaps, to say, however, that, while admitting the force of Professor Ramsay's arguments for the Pauline theory of degeneration, we do not think it follows that this theory is in itself complete any more than what Professor Ramsay represents as the modern view. If it be admitted that progress is possible—and, Professor Ramsay seems to admit this possibility—there surely may be a modern savage race which is also primitive—primitive, that is, not as being exactly in the same condition as it was thousands of years ago, but as being in a condition very little removed from that condition.

Mr. L. March Phillipps, who contributed a very interesting article on 'The Arab in Architecture' to the May number of the *Contemporary*, deals in an equally interesting way with 'Gothic Architecture and the Gothic Race.' There is, says Mr. Phillipps, a distinction in architecture more profound than the distinction of style. All styles, he says, may themselves be divided into two groups, according as they interpret human life or the laws of art. The main distinction between Greek and Gothic architecture is not so much that the Greek uses the lintel and the Goth the pointed arch as that the Greek architects worked with their attention fixed on certain absolute æsthetic laws, making it their sole endeavour to discipline and control their subject in accordance with those laws, whereas the Goths were bent on flinging themselves, their whole lives, everything they feared and loved and hated, their trades and sports and pastimes, all natural forms which attracted their fancy, and every whim, grotesque and sublime, which flashed across their minds, into the stone that shot up and developed under their hands.

In the irrepressible energy manifested in the lateral thrust which the arch exerts, the Goths, says Mr. March Phillips, would appear to have recognised a quality after their own hearts. The Greeks detested the arch on principle, and the Romans, when they used it, hid it as much as possible, but the Gothic builders actually sought to exalt and glorify what had been considered its defects. Mr. March Phillips places before his readers the main features of the development of Gothic architecture and the outstanding achievements of the Gothic race in the history of the world; and shows how a consideration of the achievements of the race in art and in life leads to the conclusion that Gothic architecture is simply the incarnation in stone of that spirit of living human energy which in the barbaric invasions resuscitated the declining Western Empire, and which is the measure of the difference between pagan and modern Europe.

Dr. C. W. Saleeby gives a brief account of the new treatment of cancer by means of ferments. At the present time, he says, there is a striking difference between the verdict of the English Cancer Research upon the results of this treatment in the mouse and that of the German Cancer Research upon its results in man. While the work of the German Cancer Research has led to the conclusion that trypsin has a specific curative effect upon cancer in man, the English workers have found that it has no action whatever upon mice. Dr. Saleeby thinks the results of the English experiments must not be taken as conclusive, and directs attention to certain encouraging results that have been lately obtained in America, Italy, and Germany.

Mr. Edward E. Lang discusses the present attitude of Indian Muhammadans towards Indian politics, and gives an account of the formation of 'The All-India Moslem League.' The formation of the League and the entrance of the Muhammadans into the field of politics are a distinct departure from the policy laid down by Syed

Ahmad Khan, but in Mr. Lang's opinion they are but the natural result of the work of the Muhammadan Educational Conference which he established in 1886. The Muhammadans now realise that they must organise themselves if they would secure a fair share of the benefits which a generous Government has to bestow upon a well-governed people. The new League, Mr. Lang says, has nothing to do with Pan-Islamism, and no Britisher need have cause to be afraid of its formation. It is a loyal movement on the part of loyal British subjects, and its object is to help the Government of India in the administration of the country, not to hinder it.

Mr. T. H. Weir discusses certain characteristics common to the prose writings of the Hebrews and the Arabs for the purpose of showing how defective in some respects the present criticism of the Old Testament is; and Mr E. Wake Cook endeavours to explain 'The Purpose of Art.' The main function of Art, he says, is to enlarge our mental boundaries, to furnish us with *vicarious experience.* 'Cruiser' discusses the conditions under which a Japanese-American war would be fought, and the Philippines as a factor in the situation. He thinks neither America nor Japan could enter upon war feeling certain of ultimate success.

Dr. Dillon writes in a somewhat unsympathetic way about The Hague Conference, its aims, and achievements, and also touches on such subjects as Japanese immigration into British Columbia, the relation between France and Russia, events in Morocco, and meetings of Emperors. Mr. A. de Bilinski gives an account of the present condition of the Turkish Army, which he does not look upon as a very effective fighting machine; and the Count de Soissons contributes an article on the painter, Jean August Ingres. There are the usual notices of books, and there is also a short letter from Admiral Mahan, with a note by Sir John Macdonell.

THE *Fortnightly Review* for September opens with 'Memorial Verses on the Death of Karl Blind' by Mr. Swinburne, hailing the departed German as a worthy compeer of those who won the world's liberties in the great fights of the past, and glorious as any figure in the 'glorious century gone.' 'The Witch of the Atlas' is one of several articles on Foreign Affairs, detailing the development of the situation in Morocco from the Algeciras Conference till now. The 'mixed police' scheme is criticised as impracticable—we need not be surprised to find it a dead letter; the strength and weakness of the French position are indicated. The occupation of Ujda has reasserted French prestige; but in the interior zone of Morocco it has produced no effect whatever. If she is to get a free hand in Morocco, France must find some means to secure the goodwill of Germany; being determined to allow no German interference in Morocco, she must concede a *quid pro quo* elsewhere. Support in regard to the Bagdad Railway, and an ultimate alliance, is the price Germany would probably exact. In the meantime, the wisest policy for France is "to remain firmly and permanently upon the defensive at Casa Blanca," and not waste her strength on warring down the opposition of fanatical and inaccessible tribes.

The Servian diplomatist, Chedo Mijatovich, gives an account of 'The Balkan Problems' which will help the reader to understand the peculiarly tangled situation indicated by the name Macedonia. Neither ethnically, linguistically, nor ecclesiastically is Macedonia a unity. Even the Slavs in its population are hopelessly divided—Serbs and Bulgars in perpetual conflict and ferment. Annexation to Greece, Bulgaria, or Servia, is impracticable; the persistent attempts at Bulgarization, by a skilful political and ecclesiastical propaganda, is largely responsible for the present troubles. The immediate suppression of internecine guerilla warfare between Greek, Bulgar, and Serb, is imperatively necessary. The writer advocates the appointment of a Governor-General for Macedonia under the suzerainty of the Sultan. This would check the ambitions of the rival nations on the borders; it would preclude Austria from advancing to Salonika, which should be made a free port, with a European guaranty of neutrality; this would deprive Russia of any claim to

a counterpoise in the east of the Peninsula, and of Austria's support for such a claim; and the autonomy of Albania (a necessary sequel to the autonomy of Macedonia) would give the basis of a settlement between Austria and Italy.

In connexion with this, the following article, by Miss Sellers, 'Sidelights on Latter-Day Montenegrins,' has an added interest. Besides helping to explain the fascinating interest of this little nation, the article serves to illustrate their importance as a factor in the eternal Balkan Question. Pent in by the Austrians, north and south, they are determined to expand to the eastward; the vilayet of Novibazar is for them 'a matter of life and death.' Never conquered by Turkey (there has never been a mosque in Cetinje) this 'nation of heroes' knows, better perhaps than any other Balkan people, how to deal with the Turks. Their great hope lies in the growth of friendship between England and Russia; then all will be well with Montenegro—"that every peasant in the land knows." Foreign Affairs are also the subject of a Chronique, which deals first with the present state of the *entente cordiale*—already cooling, it is alleged, under the influence of affairs in Morocco, and the rather clumsy efforts of tactless enthusiasts in England to secure improved relations with Germany. The tragic irony that has made the bombardment of Casa Blanca an accompaniment, and the extinction of Korea a consequence, of the Peace Conference, is set forth; and the triumph of the United States and the South American republics in the assertion of the 'Drago Doctrine,' is traced to its origin. The futility of such Conferences, as an auxiliary to peace, is enlarged upon; and the Royal visits of the month reviewed. It is evident that Russia is coming back to her old place in European politics; and the significance of this for affairs in Morocco and in Persia must be noted. German ambitions are discussed, especially in the light of an alleged interview between Gambetta and Bismarck. Balkan affairs are also touched upon, with their bearings on German politics, and the possible revival of the *Holy Alliance*.

Questions of home politics come into several articles. 'The Trades Disputes Act and Freedom of Contract' is a painstaking and lucid attempt to clear the questions at issue between organised capital and organised labour from the language of prejudice, to show the reader the bearing and the intention of recent legislation on the subject, and to summarise the present position. The question is, how far the policy of the boycott is to be allowed as a weapon in the competitions of trade; 'freedom of contract' has no inherent sanctity, but is and must be maintained in so far as it is vital to the end we may set before ourselves. In 'Women's Rights in Realms Afar,' John Davidson contributes a parable on the Suffrage question. Travellers from the kingdom of Missanthe and the republic of Urragard tell of the developments there that have followed from the grant of the franchise to mothers of five legitimate children and from the passionately logical extension of the suffrage to all and sundry respectively. 'Let him that readeth understand.' Col. Pollock, partly developing ideas of his own, partly expounding Mr. Haldane's proposals, points out the advantages to be secured by organizing 'Army Reserves on a Militia Basis.' Stronger battalions of seasoned troops enlisted on a modified long-service system will be able to assimilate a large proportion of militia-trained reserves, who have the requisite *knowledge* to become good soldiers, but lack practice. This is likely to yield better results than the incorporation for active service of older, but rusty, reservists, with a comparatively junior and unseasoned nucleus of effectives. Sir Francis Channing's article on 'Sir James Graham' is chiefly historical in its interest; but in the light it throws on the great days of Peel and Palmerston, and the development of Gladstone's ideals and sympathies, it touches on forces which are not yet spent; and the life of great statesmen should always have a value for after-generations.

'The Friends of Living Creatures and John Ruskin' deals with a pretty subject, and one likely to command the sympathy of Indian readers. But it is written in a hopelessly affected style,

that robs it of half its charm. Ruskin's own letters are interesting; and the advice to his young friends not to attribute to the animals they knew "more cleverness than you are sure of," and to state the facts with precision, is admirable. 'East and West in Council,' starting with the contrast between the 'restlessness' of the European and the reserved energy of the Oriental, passes on to a development of rival views (all ostensibly Japanese) of the underlying significance of the recent history of Japan. The article has its value for East and West alike, though each might demur to some of the sentiments expressed by its apologists. 'The Irish Priests' are the subject of a sympathetic article by Katharine Tynan, who indignantly (and, be it added, pardonably) resents some of the 'pictures' recently set forth in fiction and criticism as examples of the class. 'Misplaced Monuments' is an elaborate, and consequently tedious, treatment of the mistaken craze for statuary and monuments of the great in northern cities. Condensed into a half-dozen epigrams, its substance would have been telling; spread out, it merely bores.

'The Angola Slave-Trade' is a temperate, but stirring, appeal for the suppression of one particular line along which 'that open sore of the world' is draining the life-bood of Africa. Under the fiction of indentured labour, the agents in Portuguese West Africa carry on a tyrannical and death-dealing traffic in human life for two little islands in the equatorial seas that produce a fifth of the cocoa of the world. It is hoped that the great cocoa firms may unite, and general co-operation is desired to check this inhuman traffic by the effective use of the boycott.

'Cricket in 1907' reviews (before the close of the season) the principal factors that have been seen in the results of the County Championship, and deals with the exploits of the South African team—especially with their elaboration and development of the new bowling invented by Mr. B. J. T. Bosanquet, and its influence on first-class cricket. The writer, Mr. Sewell, also deplores, and we join with him in the lament, the declension that threatens to take away the meaning of the saying, 'That's not quite cricket.' It is to be hoped this tendency will be arrested before it is too late.

Another instalment of 'The Stooping Lady' completes the number.

THE *Nineteenth Century* opens with a reply by Mr. Barker to Lord Eversley's article of last month. He insists that Germany's policy with regard to Holland is menacing to the peace of Europe. In order to force Holland into the Customs Union, there is being made at the cost of £10,000,000 the Rhine-Emden Canal to divert the German trade of Rotterdam and Antwerp to Emden. The merchants of Holland would welcome a change that gave them access to the German market. And, as to political union, Holland and Denmark could be admitted into the German Federation as kingdoms, so there is no question of expropriation.

Germany has a population of 62 millions and increasing by a million a year; to provide for such numbers, she requires more territory, either for colonisation or for markets; she needs also harbours and these must be Antwerp and Rotterdam. Both these projects bring her into collision with Britain; for the most desirable colonies are British, nor could Britain endure the establishment of naval ports so near her shores.

She has therefore set herself the task of building up a navy capable of meeting British fleets with some prospect of success. Mr. Barker challenges Lord Eversley's comparisons of the British Fleet with those of France and Germany combined, but his arguments have all the air of special pleading. He thinks that the Two-Power standard should refer to Germany and the United States; and says that these powers have forty battleships to Britain's thirty-nine, but total tonnage, or gun-power is not given.

If Germany were to attempt invasion of England, she would utilise all the shipping in her ports; a member of her general staff says that with fair weather 100,000 men could be conveyed across in a little over thirty hours. Besides the eighteen Dreadnoughts, Germany is to build six cruisers larger, faster, and more heavily armed than the Invincible. The

Kiel canal will be ready for the passage of ships long before it is completed.

Mr. A. S. Hurd writes on 'Japan's Ascendency and her Naval Development.' The original agreement between the Japanese and the British kept France out of the war, and secured for the Japanese a fair field and no favour. The new treaty is a restatement by the two Governments of their determination to maintain the status quo against all comers, and, if necessary, by combined force of arms. France and Russia have concluded similar treaties with Japan, and the other powers will be bound to follow. This diplomatic victory is much more remarkable than their victory in arms.

Japan does not propose to add greatly to the numbers of her warships. Built and building, and including captures from Russia, she has eleven battleships and the same number of large cruisers. As these grow obsolete they will be relegated to the second line and replaced by new ships.

From the war, three lessons may be learnt. The first of these is the importance of concentration. The Japanese resisted the temptation to detach squadrons to defend Formosa or to protect their commerce, and consequently were able to crush their enemy. Second, the torpedo is an important weapon but only when it has the support of the gun. Third, speed is of great importance both in strategy and tactics. Admiral Enquist, who escaped to Manila, reported "The enemy's tactics were directed to preventing us from getting through to Vladivostok. Every time our squadron attempted to steer northwards, the Japanese, thanks to their superior speed, headed off our columns, their battleships concentrating their fire on our leading ships."

Of subsidiary lessons, the chief are the uselessness of the 6 in. gun as a secondary arm, the necessity of good 'fire control,' and the provision of a highly skilled engineering staff.

Captain H. A. Wilson writes on the Senussia, that mysterious Muhammadan organization in the North of Africa. There is very general discontent among the native population of Africa, and this the Senussia may some day kindle into a flame. It is specially active among trained native troops. To them the message is "Wait, for the time is not yet: rest now, but when the hour arrives, rise, slay, and spare not."

Sheikh Senussi, an Algerian Arab, started in 1835 a zawia or monastery at Alexandria, but was excommunicated and had to flee. He then established a zawia on the Lybian coast where he lived and preached the purification of Islam and the liberation of Muslim Africa from the infidel, for which end undying hostility to every Kafir is enjoined. His son, who succeeded him in 1860 and died some years ago, had great ability, and conducted the movement from Jarabul, a fortified zawia which served also as arsenal. No European has been permitted to approach it.

The Senussia is specially hostile to France and England; to these countries numbers of the Senussia are sent to be educated.

In an article on 'The Educational Ladder and the Girl' it is pointed out that the secondary school curriculum is not well adapted to most of the girls who go there from the primary school. Few of them are fit to go to the University, and for the others the time-table is overcrowded with subjects. (English Literature and History should receive more attention). The clerical market is overstocked in consequence. A clerk's life is monotonous and unhealthy, and a very bad preparation for motherhood. Miss Low thinks that most of the elementary teachers should have received their education at secondary schools, very few elementary school girls having the necessary qualities. Domestic service is advocated, with the proviso that the servant should have fixed hours and live at home.

In 'A Morning with the Postmaster-General" Mr. Henniher Heaton gives an imaginary conversation between that official and the Secretary. In it he calls attention to various grievances, the chief being that in many cases the Post Office is not liable for loss or damage to letters.

An article on the present position of the British Government discusses the Education question and appears to favour the secular solution. The House of Lords must go and disestablishment and disendowment of the

Church of England come sooner or later.

Sir Robert Hunter shows in an article on the enclosure of commons, that it was chiefly the improvement of agricultural methods which led to this.

"The Man in the Street" is the subject of an excellent essay by Mr. Stephen Paget, the surgeon. The Man in the Street, he says, is my neighbour when I am speaking of him; and he is I, when my neighbour is speaking of him. He is well-meaning, a faithful husband, a kind father, honest and sober; but he is dreadfully short-sighted, almost blind, to his own remote interests. The young men on the Mount survey the universe, he discovers it in the street.

Nobody, with a good microscope, can fail to discover the universe, especially if he is not looking for it. The first-floor people are curiously ignorant about the inner life of the Man in the Street. Each of them is under the delusion that his own subject interests us. When we are tired talking about ourselves, which seldom happens, we talk about the street. They do us wrong who think of us as indifferent to art and religion; they are confusing the Man in the Street with the man at the street-corner.

COLLEGE NOTES.

The Annual Sports of the College Athletic Association were successfully held on the 9th, 10th, and 11th instant. The names of the successful competitors in the various events will be published next month.

On the 14th inst., in the Anderson Hall, there was presented to the College a portrait in oils of the late Mr. F. P. H. Stirling. The portrait was entirely the gift of the students of the College, who desired thus to perpetuate the memory of a professor much beloved. The presentation was made in the name of the students by Mr. C. S. Venkatasubrahmanyam, who read a graceful tribute to his former professor. Mr. Pittendrigh then unveiled the portrait, and thanked the students in the name of the College authorities and of Mr. Stirling's relatives.

We have pleasure in recording that a former student of the College, Mr. J. S. Lazarus, has been successful in obtaining the appointment of Chief Assistant Electrical Engineer to the Corporation of Monmouth. Mr. Lazarus took his course in Electrical Engineering at the Technical College, Battersea, after passing the London Matriculation Examination. He has also distinguished himself in another way. As a member of the Imperial Gloucester Hussars, he won the silver cup for rifle-shooting.

M. E. PRESS, MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS.